THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

Volume XV NOVEMBER, 1929 Number 4

A MOTOR TEST FOR DYSPHEMIA (STUTTERING)*

ROBERT WEST
University of Wisconsin
EDWARD NUSBAUM
Milwaukee State Teachers College

THE PROBLEM

MANY attempts have been made to discover a measurable factor which would clearly differentiate stutterers from non-stutterers. It has been sometimes assumed that there is a single predominant factor upon which the two groups would divide. Too many investigators, however, have tried to isolate this single factor rather than to seek all the possible factors.

For the most part, the results obtained in these attempts are far from conclusive. It has not been proven that there is any single cause of, or any one invariable accompaniment of dysphemia. On the contrary, authorities in the field of speech correction generally agree that dysphemia can arise from a great many causes. As Dr. L. O. Anderson states:[1] . . . "the variety in the form and occurrence of stuttering indicates that there are probably many sorts of contributing factors."

Dr. Anderson assumed that dysphemia was the symptom of a

* This term is recommended by the committee on Terminology, of the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech. Dysphemia describes the general nature of the disorder of which stuttering is the chief symptom.

[1] ANDERSON, LEWIS O. "Stuttering and Allied Disorders" in *Comparative Psychology Monographs* (March 1923); Williams & Wilkins Company, Baltimore, Md. p. 17.

nervous dis-organization sufficiently general so that it might show itself in other symptoms superficially unrelated to dysphemia. For his Ph. D. thesis, he took this problem:[2]

"The present investigation is an attempt to find out if some of the contributing factors in stuttering and allied speech defects consist of certain peculiarities of nervous organization which, though apparent to ordinary observation as defects only in the field of speech, could nevertheless be found by means of tests to ramify through other fields of behavior."

Dr. Anderson came to this conclusion:[3] "In sum, the results of several tests give evidence that stutterers differ from certain other people not merely in speech reactions, but in other types of reactions which have no apparent connection with speech."

To summarize Dr. Anderson, we might say that, whatever difference there is between a stutterer and a non-stutterer, the speech difficulty is only one manifestation of that difference.

Another significant study was undertaken by Dr. Elizabeth P. McDowell at Columbia University. Dr. McDowell states her problem as follows:[4] "This study recounts an attempt to understand more fully the nature of stuttering and its possible effect upon those afflicted with this speech difficulty."

Her procedure was to select an experimental group of stutterers and an equivalent control group of non-stutterers. From 7 schools in New York City the experimental group of 61 stutterers was selected. Another group of non-stutterers was carefully chosen, matching the stuttering group as to chronological age, mental age, intelligence, sex, language, and racial background. These two groups were then tested as to intelligence, through both language and non-language tests, school achievement, emotional and social adjustments, physical traits and other speech difficulties.

The conclusions reached in this study were all negative. In summarizing her results, Dr. McDowell writes:[5] "The data which have been assembled may be disappointing to those wishing more

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

[4] McDowell, Elizabeth D. *Educational and Emotional Adjustments of Stuttering Children:* Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University (1928). p. 1.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

positive conclusions concerning the relationship between stuttering and nervous disorder. The angles from which we have been able to study the two groups have shown a surprising amount of similarity between the stutterers and the controls.''

In the non-language tests given the two groups there was an insignificant difference favoring the experimental group (stutterers). There were equally insignificant differences, one way or the other, in school achievement and physical traits. Even in the matter of emotional adjustments, as judged by the Woodworth-Cady, Woodworth-Matthews Questionnaires, and Kent-Rosanoff Association Tests, the groups were very similar.

There are two plausible explanations of the negative findings in this study: either the investigator did not combine the various ratings in such a way as to show a significant correlation between any two or more of the various tests; or else, all of the possible causative factors of dysphemia were not measured in this investigation.

In reference to the first of the above explanations, a factor that might produce dysphemia under given circumstances would fail to operate entirely in a different situation. For example, it is generally agreed that emotional disturbances and speech disorders are in some way related. Yet Dr. McDowell found no significant differences between the examined groups in the matter of emotional adjustment. Furthermore, there are plenty of clinical cases of stutterers who give no evidence of any feelings of inferiority or of any other emotional problems separating them from non-stutterers. Some other factor must be present to produce dysphemia in those cases in which no emotional problems are discoverable. The present investigation is an atempt to derive an objective measure of this unknown.

THE PROCEDURE

We present data on 64 cases, 25 of whom show dysphemia. Of this 25, 18 are male. All of the 64 cases are adults between the ages of 18 and 45.

We believed that the object of our search (i. e., the discovery of a measurable factor clearly differentiating normals from stutterers) was to be found in other fields than that of intelligence, or that of emotional adjustment. Our mode of approaching this problem was suggested by the fact that certain cases of dysphemia,

brought on by some organic lesion and disappearing with the cure of the lesion, showed very sluggish movements in the muscles of the face and mouth. This seemed significant because the muscles were definitely sluggish in non-speech movements as well as in articulation.

We devised a test to record the maximum speed with which these muscles could operate in purely repetitious acts. The apparatus was very simple. A Morse key was connected to an electro-magnetic recording lever, whose writing point was in vertical alignment with that of a chronograph. The record was made on the smoked drum of a slow-moving kymograph.

The first group of muscles to be tested were the skeletal muscles used in opening and closing the jaw. The subject was asked to close the circuit by biting the key, holding the apparatus in his mouth like a mouth organ. At the instant the circuit was closed, he released the key by opening his mouth. A little practice was given the subject so that he would be entirely familiar with the apparatus. He was again instructed to open and close the key continuously, and at his greatest speed. On this trial a record was kept of his speed.

The other group of muscles that we tested in this manner were the superficial muscles of the upper face. The apparatus was set up in such a way that the subject could close the key by drawing down the eyebrow. With a little practice, the subject was asked to do this at his greatest speed. The speed was recorded. A combined rating was made simply by adding the score made in the jaw-movement test to the score made in the brow-movement test. The numbers refer to the times per second that the first group of muscles operated in closing the circuit, plus the number of movements made by the second group of muscles. See Tables I, II, and III for results. (The hand-tapping test was given simply to serve as a check on our technique through comparison with previous reports of similar studies.)

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In examining Tables I and II, we note that in the combined rating of jaw and brow, normal males are 1.76 units faster than stuttering males. The probability that this figure represents a real difference is enormously increased by the fact that normal females differ from stuttering females by about the same amount (2.17),

and in the same direction. Similarly we find that normal males are faster than normal females in this combined rating by 1.11 units.

TABLE I

RATINGS OF SIXTY-FOUR SUBJECTS

(1) Combined rate of movement of the jaw and brow.
(2) Hand-tapping rate.

Number of Cases	(1) Means	(1) Probable Error of Means	(2) Means	(2) Probable Error of Means
21 males normal	9.26	.262	7.98	.159
18 males stuttering	7.50	.172	6.93	.126
18 females normal	8.15	.148	7.21	.88
7 females stuttering	5.98	.295	7.53	.258

NOTE: The hand-tapping rate was taken to check our technique by comparison with other studies.
The probable error was found by: P. E. of M. $= \frac{.8453 \text{ M. V.}}{\sqrt{N}}$

TABLE II

DIFFERENCES IN THE JAW-BROW TEST

Between	Difference	Probable error of difference	D/P. E.	Probability of a real difference
Normal and stuttering males	1.76	.313	5.62	9999.2 in 10000
Normal and stut. females	2.17	.33	6.58	10000 in 10000
Norm. males & norm. females	1.11	.30	3.70	9937 in 10000
Stut. males & stut. females	1.52	.341	4.45	9987 in 10000

NOTE: The P. E. was calculated by: P. E. of D. $= \sqrt{\text{P. E.}^2\text{M.} + \text{P. E.}^2\text{M}_2}$
The probabilities were derived from Table 45 on page 200 of *Mental and Social Measurements* by Thorndike.

This difference is to be expected since we know that in the hand-tapping test investigators have found a real difference in favor of the male sex.[6] Our own findings in the hand-tapping test (Table I) show a difference of .77 units between normal males and normal females. There is, also, a difference of 1.05 units between the normal males and stuttering males. However, we find an insignificant difference in the other direction between normal and stuttering females. From this we infer that the neuro-muscular processes involved in the hand-tapping test are not related directly to those involved in speech. The nerve distribution to the facial and mouth muscles must therefore be a larger determining factor

[6] REAM, MERRILL J., "The Tapping Test: A Measure of Motility," *Psychological Monographs;* Vol. XXXI, No. 1, p. 311.

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF NORMALS AND STUTTERERS IN THE JAW-BROW TEST

A

Normal Males		Stuttering Males		Normal Females		Stuttering Females	
1	12.5	1	9.7	1	10.25	1	7.5
2	12	2	8.85	2	9.75	2	6.85
3	11.5	3	8.8	3	9.15	3	6.7
4	10.75	4	8.4	4	9	4	6.1
5	10.5	5	8.2	5	8.55	5	5.6
6	10.4	6	8	6	8.5	6	4.6
7	10.25	7	8	7	8.4	7	4.5
8	10	8	7.8	8	8.25		
9	9.75	9	7.6	9	8.2		
10	9.75	10	7.25	10	8		
11	9	11	7	11	8		
12	9	12	7	12	7.8		
13	8.9	13	7	13	7.75		
14	8.5	14	7	14	7.5		
15	8.35	15	6.9	15	7.35		
16	8.3	16	6.2	16	7.25		
17	8	17	5.75	17	6.85		
18	7.5	18	5.7	18	6.25		
19	7.25						
20	6.25						
21	6.25						

NOTE: Section A gives the actual combined rating for each subject in the four groups, arranged in order. Section B shows graphically the rank-order distribution of normal and stuttering males. S = stutterer; N = normal. The number at the bottom indicates the lowest score made in the test. Section C is a similar distribution for females.

B Males	C Females
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
N	N
S	N
N	N
N	N
N	S
S	N
S	N
N	N
S	N
N	S
N	S
S	N
S	S
N	S
S	S
S	S	4.5
S	
N	
N	
S	
S	
S	
S	
S	
N	
N	
S	
S	
S	5.7

in the functioning of the muscles of speech than is the nerve distribution to the arms and hands.

Table III shows the distribution of stutterers and non-stutterers, according to sex, arranged in the order of their scores in the jaw-brow test. In section B, the middle 50% of the normal males and the middle 50% of the stuttering males are enclosed in brackets. Note that *there is no overlapping.* It is only the upper quartile of the stutterers that overlap with the middle 50% of the normals, and the lower quartile of the normals that overlap the lower 75% of the stutterers.

With the normal and stuttering females, the separation is almost complete. The highest female stutterer is not as high as either the medium or the average of the normal females.

On the basis of these data we may safely assume that sluggishness in the action of certain facial and jaw muscles is a cause of, or is related to, a cause of dysphemia. If there had been no overlapping between the stuttering and normal groups we might believe that the factor tested was the only cause of dysphemia. And conversely, if there had been a complete overlapping, we would consider that this was not a relevant factor at all. However, because the separation is so very nearly complete in both the male and female groups, we believe that this factor is a more significant determiner of dysphemia than any other single condition.

So far we have been considering only the group implications of the data. What then would our findings show, in regard to individual cases? The median case of the normal male group has a rating of 9. There is only one male stutterer that has a higher rating. We might infer, in regard to this patient, that the cause of his stuttering lies in the field of emotional or psychic disturbance, and is not due to a neurological imbalance. As a matter of fact, this patient has an environmental background that most mental hygienists would consider decidely unwholesome. We would naturally look for improvement in his speech because this test reveals a capacity for rapid coordinations of the muscles of face and jaw. His problem is one of emotional re-education.

What will we say of normal subjects 20 and 21? Only three male stutterers fall below them. Our inference here is that these subjects are potential stutterers, but that because of excellent men-

tal hygiene, they have escaped having any apparent speech disorders.

This test has a greater diagnostic value for stutterers with high ratings than for stutterers with low ratings. In the latter case we do not know what other causes, in addition to a neuro-muscular sluggishness may have operated to produce dysphemia. There may be no emotional problems apparent at all. In fact, many of our cases show no emotional or social maladjustment. Each individual case must of course be decided according to the factors which enter into the particular case history.

It has been estimated that 1% of our population show dysphemia. Assuming this to be a fair estimate, the normal probability that any unselected individual will show dysphemia is 10 in 1000. We are interested in how our test will indicate any given man's probability of being a stutterer. We have an artificial sampling of 39 adult males, 18 of whom show dysphemia. In other words, the normal probability in our sampling, of any given man being a stutterer, is 462 in 1000. Of those 10 subjects who rate 7 or below, 8 are stutterers; they show a ratio of 800 per 1000. Any subject then, rating 7 or below, has about twice the normal probability of being a stutterer. In like manner, of the 18 subjects rating 8 or below, 13 show dysphemia. Their ratio is 722 per 1000; i. e., any subject rating 8 or below has about 1.5 times the normal probability of being a stutterer. Computing by this method, the probability of dysphemia in a subject rating 9 or below is increased by 1.4 times, and the probability of dysphemia in a subject rating 9 or above is exactly 1/6 of the normal probability.

From a study of Table III and its implications we may draw these tentative conclusions:

1. Poor mental hygiene alone may (in rare instances) result in dysphemia.

2. A neuro-muscular imbalance alone (i. e., without any discoverable phychic factors) may result in dysphemia.

3. Any patient rating high in the jaw-brow test can be prognosed as hopeful, provided that it is possible to render his emotional life hygienic and wholesome.

4. A subject rating low in the jaw-brow test may not show dysphemia if the subject's mental hygiene is wholesome.

5. The majority of those who stutter do so because of the un-

happy combination of poor mental hygiene and neuro-muscular sluggishness in the facial and jaw muscles.

Investigation in this field has just begun. There are countless questions yet unanswered. It is important to know, for instance, if training the muscles of the jaw and mouth may improve the speech of a stutterer. Again, we are interested in whether this test can be applied to children. The present study may serve as a sign post to those who wish to make a more elaborate and complete investigation of this problem.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

What significance does this investigation have for workers in speech correction, and for those physicians, psychiatrists, and social workers who may have to deal with the problem of stuttering? Are they to assume that, in every case, there is some deep-seated emotional disturbance making impossible a normal adjustment to society? If practitioners insist upon unearthing a personality factor in every case of dysphemia, it is quite natural that they would overlook a possibly greater factor, namely the neurological malfunctioning of the individual.

We do not mean to deny the existence of harmful emotional attitudes which we believe are often responsible for speech disorders. But we think it well to point out that one can easily go too far in attributing every case of dysphemia to emotional maladjustment. A slight peculiarity, which in a normal person would pass unnoticed is often magnified by psychoanalysts until it appears in a stuttering case as a factor of depravity.

Pressey and Pressey, in their book called *Mental Abnormality*, have a very helpful chapter on the normal individual. In the thinking of too many persons all people are divided into two classes, the normals and the "nit-wits." A person is either "crazy" or sane. The absurdity of such a view is at once apparent in any serious study of the so-called normal individual. The Presseys have pointed out that certain traits of abnormality may be found at times in all of us. They say: "The reader must also be warned against the idea that mental disease is like tuberculosis or typhoid fever, that one either has it, or hasn't it.... The comparison should rather be with dyspepsia, constipation or insomnia, some part of the total organism is not doing its work as it should and conditions vary by imperceptible degrees from normality. It should

also be realized that . . . as one may occasionally have a digestive upset without by any means having an unhealthy stomach, so one may have his emotional ups and downs . . . without being mentally abnormal.''[7]

We find the same thing to be true in regard to our physical bodies. Only a few of us, if any, have perfect bodies; instead of this, we find defects of one sort or another in practically all of humanity. Statistics show an enormous percentage of defects among school children. 30% of the older school children have visual defects, around 5% have defects of hearing, 40% have decayed teeth, 20% have diseased tonsils, and so on.[8]

From all this data we conclude that normality is a theoretical concept but a practical impossibility. Everyone has certain aches or pains, certain structural defects, and occasional failures of certain organs or glands to function properly. In like manner, none of us are perfectly adjusted socially and emotionally. We harbor little prejudices; we feel inferior in certain situations; we are sensitive to what others say; we may be quick-tempered, snobbish, or what not.

And yet how few of us stutter? Roughly 1 in 100. And those who do stutter show no clearly demonstrable differences in emotional adjustment from non-stutterers.[9] It is not only foolish but dangerous to continue diagnosing all cases of dysphemia from the psychic point of view. A great deal of harm can be done by creating a morbidly introspective attitude in an individual whose difficulty is organic. There is in our clinic today a girl who was formerly studied by another specialist as a functional stutterer. This worker has written that ''she impresses one as being extremely sensitive and unpleasantly repressed.'' In our opinion she is one of the most poised and rational human beings that we knew. The facts in the case would indicate that hers is an organic difficulty. There is a slight hemiplegia on the right side, dating from an alleged stroke of paralysis at the age of two. She had epileptiform convulsions during childhood. She has had very little con-

[7] PRESSEY AND PRESSEY, *Mental Abnormality;* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927: p. 81.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[9] MCDOWELL, ELIZABETH D., (see footnote, p. 470).

This year our work has been to assist her in gaining voluntary control of the muscles of the face and mouth. She seems happier, and is not worrying about any possible emotional maladjustment. trol of the facial or mouth muscles, and she made the lowest score in our jaw-brow test.

We are helping her to be as objective as possible in her relationships with other people, not by talking about it, but by giving her exercises to do, and by suggesting participation in outside activities. Improvement is very slow, as it must be in any case of this nature, but the patient reports definite progress.

This is an example of a type of disorder which we believe should not be treated as a functional case. In other clinics there are no doubt many whose history would parallel hers. It is important that workers in speech correction should never form a premature conclusion as to the nature of the disorder. And even where the type of disorder and the cause seem well established. the careful specialist will not consider the case history as a closed book. A test, such as the one we have suggested in this paper, might well be given to every case of dysphemia. Such a test gives an objective rating of the patient's capacity for coordination, irrespective of any emotional factor that might enter into the etiology of the disorder. To have this rating will certainly increase the probability of accuracy in any prognosis in addition to suggesting the best meanings of arresting the disorder. We sincerely hope that this preliminary report will be followed by reports from other investigators, leading to the establishment of well-founded norms by which to judge any given case.[10]

---

[10] For an explanation of the neurological problems involved here see: WEST, ROBERT. "A Neurological Test for Stutterers," *Journal of Neurology and Psychopathology* (London), Vol. IX, No. 11, Nov. 1929.

A STUDY OF LIP MOVEMENTS IN SPEECH

V. A. UTZINGER
Carroll College

THAT the lips play an important part in proper articulation is certain, for they have the last chance to change the vibratory column of air, and it is largely due to this that proper articulation results. Just how much the lips should move in speaking is debatable. In some cases undoubtedly there is too much lip movement, so that it becomes obvious and distracting. It would seem, however, that the greatest difficulty does not lie in too much movement, but rather in inactive and lazy lips.

In view of the complex musculature of the oral aperture it is plain that the active movement of the lips is a complicated procedure and involves a complex system of antagonistic muscle action. Since this is true we should expect rather wide variations in the lip action of individuals; which variations will not be without influence on successful speech.

Prior investigations in this field have been few, and have made no direct attempt to study separately the movements of the two lips. Devices have been constructed to record mouth action, but these drew only one curve which was the resultant of the movements of both lips. Rousselot[1] in his experiments used a mouth apparatus of this nature to test and study the articulatory organs during the opening and closing of the vocal canal. Scripture,[2] by use of a rubber bulb placed between the lips, recorded lip pressure. He compared the period of time taken in the initial lip consonants by normals and stammerers. Stetson[3] tested the relation between breath expulsion and lip action.

This study is concerned with the phasic relationship of the two lips in action rather than the relationship of lip movement to

[1] Taken from SCRIPTURE, E. W. *The Study of English Speech by New Methods of Phonetic Investigation.* Oxford University Press, London, 1923. p. 2.

[2] SCRIPTURE, E. W. *Stuttering and Lisping.* Macmillan, N. Y. 1912.

[3] STETSON, R. H. "Motor Phonetics." In *Archives Neerlandaises de Phonetique Experimental,* V. III, 1928, La Societé Hollandaise des Science à Harlem. p. 16.

that of any other part of the speech mechanism. Tests were made of (1) the muscular control of the upper and lower lips in the rounded vowel sounds; (2) the distance each lip moves in the articulation of labial consonants; (3) which lip action precedes; and (4) the comparison of distance and rate of movement of the upper and lower lips.

Two pieces of apparatus were used in making these tests. The apparatus to test the vertical movements of the lips consisted of two thin metal lip pieces atached to Marey tambours which were connected by means of rubber tubes to tambours registering on a smoked drum. The lip pieces were curved to fit just inside the lips and properly adjusted to the height of each subject. The tension of the tambour membranes was so adjusted that equal forces amplied to the lip pieces moved them the same distance at the same velocity.

The apparatus used in testing the horizontal movement of the lips consisted of a lip piece attached to a recording tambour. The piece was so fashioned that both lips could be placed against it and moved horizontally in protrusion and retraction.

Before testing with the apparatus the profile of the lips was recorded by outlining a silhouette on a screen to the side of the subject. The object of this was to discover if there was any correlation between the size of the lips and the amount opened in the "Ah" position.

The testing procedure proper began with the adjustment of the lip pieces of the vertical apparatus to the subject's lips. During the tests particular care was taken that there was no head movement and that only the movement of the lips was recorded.

Records were made (1) of the vertical movements of the lips in time with a metronome; (2) and (3) of the muscular control of the upper and lower lips during phonation of sustained "OO" and "OH" sounds; (4) of lip movements in various nonsense syllables, including lip consonants and rounded lip vowels; (5) of lip movements during the reading of words containing double consonants, such as Bobby, Puppy, etc.; and (6) of lip movements during the reading of a sentence containing lip consonants and rounded lip vowels.

On the horizontal lip apparatus a record was made of the pro-

trusion and retraction of the lips and the muscular control during the sustained "OO" and "AH" sounds.

The following measurements were taken from the records:

1. The size and shape of the mouth in the normal and in the "AH" positions.
2. The phasic relationship of the upper and lower lips.
3. The amplitudes of the movements of the two lips.
4. The initial movement in closing and opening the lips.
5. The number of tremors during the sustained sounds.
6. The pattern of each lip movement in closing. (The pattern was determined by measuring the angle of inclination from the horizontal in each lip line; a sharp incline indicated a rapid movement.)

The tests were made on university students; half the number tested having had at least a year of formal speech training. The remainder of those tested had had no speech training.

The results of the experimental tests were of a two-fold nature; first, what actually happens in lip action during speech; second, the apparent effect of speech training on lip action.

In attempting to discover what actually happens in lip action it was found that during simple vertical movements without articulation the lips tend to move in phase. Only 10% of the total number tested moved their lips slightly out of phase. During the phonation of labial consonants however, 35% of the subjects tested moved their lips out of phase. Further, during articulation a greater number of untrained subjects (4%) spoke in phase. These data tend to indicate that the primitive natural movements of the lips are in phase. The biological function of the lips is sucking and taking in food. In all probability this action tends to be done with the lips moving in phase. But the acquisition of the complex muscle action for articulation tends to cause an unnatural and out-of-phase movement of the lips.

During speech the upper and lower lips tended to start the opening and closing movements simultaneously. In the articulation of the consonants "B", "P", "M", however, in every case the record of the amplitude showed a greater lower lip action. Therefore in practicing for clear lip articulation more attention should be given the lower lip.

In the horizontal movements of the lips the average amplitude

on record for the trained subjects was 3 mm. The untrained subjects showed an average amplitude of only 2.7 mm. This greater movement by the trained subjects indicates an increased flexibility of muscles, probably due to training in making the rounded vowel sounds.

In general there was a tendency for greater lip action of all kinds by those who had had speech training. This seems to be the natural result of practice and use of the lips in speaking.

A greater number of tremors occurred in every test of the lips of the untrained subjects. There seemed to be an unnatural strain on the lip muscles when they took the rounded vowel positions, with a resulting large number of both horizontal and vertical tremors in the lips of those who had not had speech training. However, control can be acquired by training, as the tests show. With this knowledge it would seem advisable to stress the exercises which will strengthen the lips in the vowel positions. The sustained "OO" sound and the repetition of the word "gold" would tend to make possible greater control of the lips. There appears to be no correlation between the muscular control of the lips and their rate of movement. (Poorly controlled lips might even tend to move more rapidly, but less smoothly, due to a nervous tension of the muscles.)

One significant fact noted was that the person without speech training opened his mouth slightly farther in saying the "AH" sound. There was no correlation, however, between the size of the lips and the amount opened for the vowel sound. The average size of the lips in the normal position was practically the same for the trained and untrained subjects, but in taking the "AH" position the untrained subjects opened their lips farther. In attempting to account for this, it is possible to say that the trained individual is more conscious of a pure tone than of how far his mouth is opened. The person who has had no speech training cares little about the tone quality but concerns himself with the opening process. When teachers of voice train solely for pure tone, they may not get proper oral opening. In working for both ends, a pure tone and a wide opening, attention of the student should be directed to both.

With a knowledge of exactly what happens in lip action during articulation and how trained students differ from students who have had no training, helpful exercises can be suggested. Flexi-

bility and control can be gained by a repeated protrusion and retraction movement and by sustaining vowel sounds such as "OO" and "OH." This should not be prolonged over ten seconds at first, but the length of time can be increased as the lip muscles strengthen. This will also reduce longitudinal lip trembling which was found to be so prevalent in the untrained subjects. Blowing and whistling exercises are also advocated to strengthen these muscles.

The practice of the lip consonants "B" and "P" is suggested for developing sufficient lip movement for proper articulation. Vertical movements of the lips without making the lip consonants is not advisable because of the diphasic movement of the lips in clear articulation. Coordination and rhythm may be furthered by sounding the consonants with a metronome.

The main conclusions derived from this study are as follows:

1. The primitive natural movements of the lips are in phase.
2. Articulatory movements tend to be out of phase.
3. There is greater movement of the lower lip in sounding the labial consonants.
4. There is a tendency for greater lip action of all kinds by those who have had speech training.
5. Speech training tends to speed up lip action. Poor articulation seems to be due to inactive or slow-moving lips.
6. A lack of control of the lips was found in all subjects tested, but training seems to aid the student in this control.
7. There is no correlation between the size and the movement of the lips.
8. There is no correlation between the size of the lips and the amount opened in articulation.
9. Training seems to decrease the amount of opening of the lips in the "AH" position.

TEACHING BUSINESS SPEAKING—A MODERN TREND

W. HAYES YEAGER
George Washington University

WITH the growing interest in public-speaking courses shown by colleges of commerce and engineering and by business men generally, the present seems to be a particularly opportune time to examine our curricula to determine just what we are doing to prepare those of our students who go into business, for the special problems of business speaking. The writer is confident that in most cases this examination will reveal that far too often students leave our courses with some general knowledge of the field of speech but with very little information of practical value in meeting the varied talking problems of a business career.

If we are to make our training serve modern needs, it must teach our students to prepare and present the special types of talks, both public and private, which the business man or woman is called on to make. Have we been doing this? If we are to judge by the types of speeches taught in most of our courses today, the answer must be an emphatic negative.

THE GENERAL PURPOSES

Most of us have been content to teach the ends or purposes of speeches and to have our students prepare speeches according to the particular classification of the purposes the instructor happens to be using. Thus many instructors have their students prepare speeches stressing *clearness, impressiveness, belief, action,* and *entertainment.*[1] Others prepare speeches with the purposes: *to interest, to make clear, to induce belief,* and *to influence conduct.*[2] Still other prepare *informative, persuasive* and *entertaining* speeches.[3] That these classifications have been very useful in supplying general arrangements of the types of speeches, there can be no question. They have been and are today of the highest importance in teaching an elementary course in effective speaking. The writer does not propose that these classifications be abandoned. Far from it! He proposes that these general ends or purposes should

[1] A. E. PHILLIPS, *Effective Speaking.*

[2] J. A. WINANS, *Public Speaking.*

[3] W. P. SANDFORD AND W. H. YEAGER, *Successful Speaking* and *Principles of Effective Speaking.*

be examined to determine what particular types under each general end or purpose are useful in training our students for the speaking of modern business life.

TYPES OF SPEECHES

It is true that attempts have been made to classify types under each general purpose but the results of these attempts are, in most cases, highly unsatisfactory and of little use to the average student. Baker in his *Forms of Public Address* arranges the various types as follows:

Eulogies
Commemorative Addresses
Dedications
Speeches of Welcome
Inaugurals
Speeches of Farewell
Addresses for Academic Occasions
Addresses on Social Questions
Legislative Addresses
Political Addresses
After-Dinner Speeches

Brigance in both *The Spoken Word* and in *Classified Speech Models* uses the following classification of the forms of address:

I Motivative Speeches
  A. Judicial
  B. Legislative
  C. Campaign
    1. Political
    2. General
  D. Pulpit
II Demonstrative Speeches
  A. Speeches of Courtesy
    1. Introduction
    2. Welcome
    3. Response
    4. Presentation
    5. Acceptance
    6. Farewell
  B. After-Dinner Speeches
  C. Commemorative Speeches
    1. Anniversary
    2. Dedicatory
    3. Inaugural
    4. Eulogies
    5. Nominating
  D. The Expository Lecture

These two classifications of the forms of address are typical of most recent attempts to divide the general purpose into more definite types of speeches. These classifications have been highly useful and important. But are we, in teaching these types, adapting our training to the many or to the few? To the writer, it seems obvious that it is to the few. Not only are we adapting our training to the few, but we are forcing the bulk of our students to conform to the types used by the few. We are not training them to speak effectively in the ordinary everyday speech situations which confront them. Take Brigance's types under *motivative* speeches as illustrative. Just how many of our students will be called on to make *judicial legislative, campaign,* and *pulpit* speeches? And yet these are the only types of motivative speeches discussed! How can the overwhelming majority of our students, who eventually find themselves in business, make use of these types in the usual speaking of business life? His list of speeches of courtesy is useful. The same is true of after-dinner and commemorative speeches. But all of these are used only on the exceptional business occasion. How often does a business man have to make a dedicatory or anniversary speech? Certainly not often enough to warrant extensive training.

The whole question involved in teaching the forms of address to our students is: Are we to continue making our training useful to the few or are we to expand it to make it useful to the many? In these days of mass education, there seems to be but one answer. To meet modern needs, we must train the mass and that means that we should teach those types of talks which the ordinary business or professional man or woman is called on to make. Let us limit our teaching of *pulpit* oratory to those who are preparing for the ministry. Let us limit our teaching of *judicial, legislative,* and *campaign* talks to those who are preparing for public life. And in a general effective speaking class, let us do no more with these types than to make our students familiar with them. In place of training them to make the exceptional type of address, let us train them to handle effectively the ordinary, every-day speech problems which confront them. Only in this way can the teaching of this phase of our subject meet the demands which are now made on it.

What types of speeches meet this modern need is the ques-

tion which now arises. In attempting to answer this question, the writer is indicating here how we have been trying to solve it at the University of Illinois. We believe that we have made a be-beginning in adapting our training to modern needs.[4] In the writer's opinion, our students can be trained far more effectively in the handling of their ordinary, every-day talking problems by teaching them to make the following types of speeches:

I More important types,
- A. Instructions
- B. Explanations
- C. Oral Reports
- D. Sales Talks
- E. Promotional Talks
- F. Good-Will Talks
- G. Discussions of Policy
- H. Inspirational Talks

II Less important types,
- A. Courtesy Talks
  1. Introduction
  2. Presentation
  3. Acceptance
  4. Welcome
  5. Farewell
- B. After-Dinner Talks[5]

The first group of business speech types is by a wide margin more important to the average person than the second group. The types in the first group deal with the every-day speech of most people. That each of these common types of business talks has its own peculiar technique and subject matter can hardly be denied. The student should receive effective instruction in each, if he is to be properly equipped with speech tools. Let us briefly examine the uses of these types.

Everyone has the common problem of giving instructions and making explanations. Thousands of dollars could be saved in

[4] Course 2, at the University of Illinois, called *Business and Professional Speaking*, attempts to train students to make the kind of talk, both public and private, which the ordinary business man uses in his every-day life. This course was established in 1927. Course 1, called *Principles of Effective Speaking* is the prerequisite for course 2.

[5] W. P. SANDFORD AND W. H. YEAGER, *Business and Professional Speaking*, parts II and III.

business organizations if all instructions and explanations were always clearly understood. So often costly mistakes creep in and the lame excuse, "I thought you meant a number two casting instead of a number three," or "I didn't know you wanted it delivered today," etc., cannot repair the damage. These errors can be prevented by giving clear instructions and explanations. If we teach our students how to give clear instructions and make clear explanations, and give him methods of testing the understanding of the hearer, we can help him to handle these problems effectively.

The oral report is a necessity in every business organization. The salesmanager reports to the president on the possibilities of developing new territory. The plant superintendent reports to the vice-president in charge of manufacturing on the operation of a new machine. They have a definite type of talk to make and must be governed by the technique for that type. When our students are taught how to make oral reports, they will be better equipped to handle effectively this type of situation.

Sales talks constitute one of the most necessary types of business speaking. Yet the proper procedure for this type of motivative talk is almost entirely neglected in speech courses. In a sense, this is the most important type of speaking done by the members of any business organization. If the speaking of the sales organization is ineffective, the products manufactured by the factory cannot be sold widely. The result is decreased production and in some cases a complete stoppage of manufacture. Why not train our students to make this highly important type of business talk?

Closely related to the sales talk is the general promotional talk, the function of which is to lay the foundation for future sales. Although it has some points of similarity to the sales talk, yet it has a distinctive technique. A business speaker's ability to handle this type of talk effectively is often the barometer which determines the development of the business in which he works.

The good-will talk is also a distinct type of business speech. The public relations departments of banks, public utilities, and other business organizations make use of good-will talks to maintain and promote friendly relations with the public. One group of public utility companies in Illinois alone recently presented more than 1800 such talks in one year. Surely this type of talk is important enough to warrant consideration in our courses.

From the point of view of the internal organization of a business, discussions of policy are very important. Most questions of policy are settled in conferences of the executives and in meetings of the stockholders. To train our students in this type of speaking is to equip them with the tools which are necessary for the successful advancement of their own interests and the interests of any organizations with which they may be associated.

The final type in this classification of the more important types of business talks is the inspirational talk. The importance of this type, in bringing about efficiency and high productivity, cannot be overestimated. No sales conference or meeting of a business organization is complete without inspirational speaking. It plays a very vital role in the advance of business generally. And yet very little attention is given to it in our courses. It appears to the writer that no course, professing to teach its students how to develop a high degree of business speaking efficiency, is complete without training in the specific techniques required for skilled inspirational speaking.

Instructions, explanations, oral reports, sales talks, promotional talks, good-will talks, discussions of policy, and inspirational talks are the more important types of business speeches. In making our courses serve modern needs, training in these types cannot be overlooked.

Besides these more important types, we have courtesy and after-dinner talks which are of somewhat less importance to the average person. Business men are sometimes called on to introduce a speaker, to present a prize or token of esteem, to accept such a prize or token and to make proper acknowledgement. He is also sometimes called on to make speeches of welcome and farewell. The degree of skill which the speaker brings to his task often has considerable influence on his future relations with the members of the audience. All of these are worthy of some consideration. What has just been said about courtesy talks also applies to after-dinner talks. Skill in good after-dinner speaking is an asset to any business man.

As has been pointed out, these less important types are so classified because the average business man is called on to make them only on the exceptional occasion. The writer believes that we, as teachers of this subject, can do much to develop high stand-

ards in the making of courtesy and after-dinner speeches. But he believes that we can serve our students best by laying special stress on the more important types in our coures.

PERSONAL CONFERENCE

Not only should our students be taught to make business talks of these types before an audience, but what is even more important, in meeting modern needs, they should be taught to make them in one form of private speaking: the *personal conference.*

The average person uses about 30,000 words a day, counting all repetitions, in communicating his ideas to others orally. It is a commonplace that the average person uses practically all of these words, not in public speaking, but in private speaking. In spite of this fact, the course which professes to train its students how to use these words effectively in the speaking of the personal conference is the exception rather than the rule. So often we have dismissed the whole subject of private speaking by saying that it is exactly like public speaking in general method and therefore no particular attention need be given to it. Thus O'Neill and Weaver say:

"In sum, it seems impossible to think of any specific quality or characteristic which clearly distinguishes conversations from public speaking. What then is the difference between them? The only essential difference between them is the size of the audience. And it is impossible, of course, to say at just what point the number of listeners changes the speech from private conversation to public address. There are cases which are clearly conversation and there are other cases which are clearly public speeches. In between lies a twilight zone where it is difficult to distinguish the conversation from the public address."[6]

Winans also, after enumerating what he calls the "Conventional differences," goes on to say:

"These and other differences may be important. They may make public speaking *seem* quite different from private speaking; but since there is practically nothing true of public speaking that may not be true at times of conversation and nothing true of conversation that may not be true of public speaking, we can hardly hold the differences essential.[7]

The statement that, "The only essential difference between them is in the size of the audience," is certainly a misinterpreta-

[6] *Elements of Speech*, p. 347.
[7] *Public Speaking*, p. 24.

tion of the facts. Equally incorrect, in the writer's opinion, is the statement, "We can hardly hold the differences essential."

There are at least two differences between public and private speaking which are of such great importance as to make them material and essential differences. These are: 1. The presentation of the speaker in the personal conference must be far more *flexible* than the usual public speech need to be. The speaker must be able to make quick adjustments to the responses of the *conferee*. And it must be remembered that these responses, in the conference, are made with words and external signs and not simple external signs alone, as is the case in the usual public speech. 2. In conference speaking the *conferrer's* presentation must be adapted to the wants and interests of a *relatively small number of people*, usually one to three, while in public speaking the adaptation is made to a relatively large number of people. This presents a distinctly different problem. Before the audience, appeals to general wants and interests may be used, while in conference these appals must be personalized to the *conferee* alone.

The author does not deny that there are many points of similarity between private and public speaking. But he contends that these two essential points of difference make it necessary to give specialized instruction in personal conference, if we are to make our training serve the needs of the mass. He believes that a large part of any course in business speaking should be given to training in the effective conduct of the personal conference.

THE PROBLEM METHOD IN PERSONAL CONFERENCE

Development of a technique for the teaching of conference speaking has been recent. Even now, much of the charting in embarking on this venture is yet to be done. How can conference speaking be taught? One method we have developed at the University of Illinois. We experimented with this problem for several years and have arrived at the conclusion that the *problem method* is the most effective technique for the purpose.

Before discussing this method in some detail, let us briefly examine one or two of the other methods which have been used. One method is to assign a subject to two persons for a conference; one to act as *conferrer* and the other as *conferee*. The *conferrer* then prepares his presentation on the basis of the information he is able to obtain about the subject and on the basis of what he

knows about the *conferee.* For two reasons, we have found this method unsatisfactory. First, it does not encourage careful preparation. Second, it is more difficult for the instructor to make helpful and detailed criticisms. With this method, students have considerable difficulty selecting the important and pertinent facts for their presentations. *Conferees* also have trouble advancing the particular objections which should be presented. In most cases, this method leads to a superficial and rather ineffective conference.

Another method, used in group conferences, is to select a general subject and then assign each student a particular phase of it for an oral report. This method is more useful than the first but again our experience has been that it does not lead to thorough work. It does not develop so high a degree of skill as the *problem method.*

The *problem method* produces the most effective conference speaking, in the class room, and in the writer's opinion, it is an invaluable technique in the teaching of this phase of our work. This method is an adaptation of the *problem method* as now used in the Babson Institute and in many colleges of commerce. Just as the student of commerce is given a definite problem to solve, so the student of business speaking is given a definite problem in business talking, on the basis of which he prepares his conference plans. The problem gives the students an actual situation and supplies them with all of the facts which are essential to solving it.

From the teaching point of view, the *problem method* makes it easier to direct the student in developing skill. It is difficult, if not entirely impossible, for the instructor to be familiar with the facts about every conference subject which, under the first method, might be assigned. With the *problem method,* the instructor also has a complete statement of the problem before him and he is thus able to criticize the technique, used by the speaker, more effectively. When all important facts are stated in the problem, the instructor can very quickly discover the student's mistakes in using his material.

The problem method has a very wide range of use. On the one hand, problems dealing with the students' actual speech situations may be used. At the other extreme, there is no limit to the artificial situations which may be created.

In order to indicate the nature and scope of the problems we

are using in conference work, two problems are included here. These not only attempt to give the students in the conference all the facts needed for the speech situation but they also give the *conferrer* an analysis of the *conferee.*

On the basis of this information, the *conferrer* is instructed to prepare his conference plans. He is required to make an outline of his talk, including every possible aspect of the subject. Only the conference itself can determine whether all the information, represented in the outline, is needed. He is told that his presentation must permit an extremely flexible treatment of his subject so as to be able to take care of all the *conferee's* questions and objections. It may develop that in the conferenee itself he will need half, or less than half, of the ideas noted in the outline. He is also told that his presentation must be adapted to the particular wants and interests of his hearer. Besides the outline of his main presentation, he is required to list all of the objections the *conferee* may advance and prepare his answers in definite form. This outline, with answers to objections, is handed to the instructor at the time of the conference. The instructor thus has a definite check on the thoroughness of the *conferrer's* preparation. The *conferee* is required to hand in at the same time a full and complete statement of his questions and objections. Throughout the students are impressed with the necessity of careful and thorough preparation.

So often we think of conference speaking as requiring little or no preparation. In fact, some writers on this subject have made the bold assertion that public speaking requires more preparation than private speaking. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Experience shows that a speaker should prepare for a conference just as carefully as for a public speech. In many cases more time and effort is required for successful conference speaking than for the usual public address.

QUEEN ELIZABETH AT THE CAMBRIDGE DISPUTATIONS

BROMLEY SMITH
The Johns Hopkins University

["the Queene went in progress to take the pleasures of the country, and visited the University of *Cambridge*, one of the eyes of *Britaine:* where being with all kindes of honour received by the Students, and delighted with Comedies, Tragedies, and *Scholasticall disputations*, she survayed every Colledge, and in a Latin Oration acknowledged their love and kindnesse, commending their multiplicity of learning, exhorting them to bend their whole minde and cogitations to the study of Good Letters; whereof she promised to deserve well." Camden: *The Historie of Elizabeth* (1630).]

ON the 17th of August, 1564, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University received a letter from Sir William Cecil, Private Secretary to Queen Elizabeth, requesting him to make ready academical exercises suitable for the entertainment of her Majesty. The Lord Bishop of London also sent up word to Cambridge, stating that the Queen would reach the University on the 8th of August and advising that she be entertained with "Sermons, both in English and Latin; Disputations in all kinds of Faculties; and playing of Comedies and Tragedies; Orations and verses, both in Latin and Greek, to be made and set up of all students, in the way that her Majesty should goe or ride."[1]

Immediately the whole University and the whole town began to "put themselves in all readiness to pleasure her Majestie." A committee went down to London to confer with the Secretary about the lodging of the Queen and her retinue, the provision of food, beer, ale, and wine, the cleaning up of the town, and the program. On their return, all to whom parts were assigned worked steadily for the next two or three weeks. For the purposes of this article most of the particulars of the Queen's progress will be omitted,

[1] The principal authorities used in the preparation of this article are Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, Nichols' *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, Fuller's *History of Cambridge*.

such as the approach to Cambridge, the magnificent parade through the town, the decorations along the line of march and at the colleges, the speeches of welcome, the poems posted on the walls, the gifts with presentation addresses, the kowtowing of the officials, the sermons and orations, the singing by trained choirs, and the dramatic performances of the students. Only the details concerning the disputations will be retained.

On Monday, August 7, the great bell of the University summoned the student body to lectures in Physic (Medicine), Dialectic, Rhetoric, Divinity, and Law, which lectures were delivered as ordinarily, though on this day in the presence of many lords and gentlemen. The appetite of the guests, having been whetted by the opening course, was keen for the disputation which began at nine o'clock. To this came the Caster of the College, escorted by the Beadles, gorgeously clad and bearing their staves of office. So many others jammed into the hall, both Lords and Gentlemen, that 'no man could stir.'' The Proctors and Mr. Leyton, the Respondent, were commanded "to put on their caps and to keep and observe the old, ancient rites." This opening disputation was moderated by Cecil, who was Chancellor of the University as well as Secretary to the Queen. The only comment made upon the exercise would seem to indicate a pleased audience, for "none departed untill the end of the disputation.

At one o'clock the great bell rang again, calling to a special program in St. Mary's church. As the queen was sure to attend this disputation, great preparation had been made to accommodate her and her retinue, and at the same time to give space for the University and distinguished visitors. The term University as here used excludes all of the undergraduate body. The students would, no doubt, have been present, but there was no room for them. If we could place ourselves in the Respondent's seat for a moment, near the center of the church, we should note a huge stage built across the chancel, upon which was the Queen's station, "richly hanged with arms and cloth of state ... with a cushion to lean on." A seat on the left of her Majesty had been reserved for the Secretary-Chancellor, "having before him the usual cloth and a long velvet cushion;" while on the right was a chair for Dr. Walter Haddon, Senior Master of the Court of Requests, who was

to be Determiner of the questions.[2] To the right of the Respondent, on special stages in and before the transept, were the Divines and the Lords; to the left in and before the other transept sat the Physicians, Lawyers and Ladies. Back of the Respondent, in the nave, were the Masters, poor fellows, doomed to stand up for five hours. Close by were stalls for the Proctors of Cambridge and the visiting Proctors from Oxford, who had come up to the Progress with their Esquire and Beadle. In the space remaining, that is, the center of the church, seated on forms, were the Bachelors of Divinity and the Non-Regents. All the University men in this vast audience wore their habits and hoods, varied in color and shape according to profession and degree; the nobility, both men and women, were clad in their best array. Banners, cloth of state, and rich tapestries lined the walls and hung from above; while crimson carpets decked the stages and rushes covered the floors.

Into this gorgeous scene, when all was ready, the "Queen's Majestic came . . . with royal pomp," stunning all with the marvel of her costume.[3] As she advanced toward her station all of the graduates "kneeled and cryed modestly, 'Vivat Regina'." Arrived at her seat, she thanked them and was made aware of the "order, differences, and placing" of the audience, by Mr. Secretary. Looking about, she inquired, "What the Proctor's seat meant?" She was told that "It was for the Proctors to moderate and rule the Disputation." Thereupon she asked for them. The Beadles promptly escorted them to their stalls. Then the Queen "being moved thereto by Mr. Secretary," gave "license to order the schools," saying, "Let all be done according to custom." Perceiving another seat, she made inquiry and found it was the one in which the Respondent sat. She then willed "'all to stand up (for till that time all kneeled) and the Disputations to begin, and to have the questions delivered unto her." Thereupon the Respondent, Mr.

[2] The Latinity of Haddon was much admired in his day. When the Queen was asked whether she preferred Buchanan or Haddon, both experts in Latin, she adroitly replied, "Buchannum omnibus antepono, Haddonem nemini postpono."

[3] The society reporters of the occasion failed to describe the Queen's costumes, except in one case. On her arrival in Cambridge she wore a "gown of black velvet pinked; a call upon her head, set with pearles and pretitious stones; a hat that was spangled with gold, and a bush of feathers."

Thomas Byng, of Peterhouse, handed "the questions to the Beadle, he to Mr. Secretary, and he to the Queen's Highness."[4] She quickly read that Mr. Byng was ready to maintain that

1. Monarchia est optimus status republicae.
2. Frequens legum mutatio est periculosa.

Then the Proctors "set the Respondent to his Oration, and all were permitted to sit."

In the quaint language of the reporter, "All the Disputations were driven" toward the Queen. This may have been an error, for when the Respondent had ended his argument, four Masters of Arts, standing near her Grace's stage, replied, looking westward; which would mean that their backs were toward the Queen, as they fronted the Respondent. No matter what arrangements there may have been for seating the disputants, some portion of the audience was bound to be behind the speaker. However that may be, her Majesty was very much pleased with the replies, making gestures of approval and preventing the Proctors "from taking them up." When finally the Opponents were "cut off," she seemed to be offended, saying, "If she had the moderation, they should not have been so abridged." The Replyers or Opponents in this debate were Thomas Cartwright, of Trinity College, Mr. Chatterton, Mr. Thomas Preston, and Mr. Clarke.[5]

When the Disputation was ended, Doctor Hadon, having obtained permission from her Highness, determine the questions in a long oration. Here his expert knowledge of Latin, as well as of the question, must have served him well.

As soon as the first disputation was out of the way, an "Act in Physick" was begun, with an entire change in the personnel.

[4] Byng afterward became Orator of the University, Master of Clare Hall, and Regius Professor of Civil Law. *Fasti Oxon.* I. 98. For the careers of the Disputants, see *Nat. Dict. Biog.*

[5] Of Preston it is related that he performed so well on Monday night in *Dido* and disputed so pleasingly in the afternoon that the Queen gave him a pension of £ 20 per annum. His comely grace, gesture, and behaviour, his pleasing pronunciation, won her heart, because "upon parity of defects, (she) always preferred propernesse of person." *Fasti Oxon.* I. 98. Fuller, *Hist. of Camb.* p. 139. Before leaving town she had Preston come to her rooms and deliver an oration before her privately. She liked it and him so well that she permitted him to kiss her hand and dubbed "hym her scholer . . . and therewithal gave him VIII angels."

Dr. Larkin, "Public Reader in Physicke," was set in the Respondent's chair to uphold two questions:

1. Simplex cibus praeferendus multiplici.
2. Coenandum liberalius, quam prandendum.

After the Opponents had announced these propositions, Dr. Caius, antient in the faculty," moved their adoption. He was to be assisted in the opponency by Drs. Fryer and Walker. When the Queen demanded a copy of the questions, as in the first disputation, she was piqued because none had been made. The Respondent went ahead however, in spite of his unpardonable omission, and "made his position." Following him came the three opposing Doctors, who disputed with such "small voices" that the Queen called out "Loquimini altius." When her command produced no improvement, because their voices were weak, (or because their backs were toward her), she left her seat and came upon the stage above their heads. Even this change of position did not enable her to hear them plainly; so "her Grace made not much of that Disputation."

One of her own physicians, Dr. Hycke, asked permission to determine the questions. After joking with him for a time, she gave consent. When he had finished his oration, about seven o'clock, her Majesty "very merrily departed," to get ready for the evening play.

Possibly the Queen was wearied by the long seance, six hours, of the disputations on Monday, plus the undergraduate performance in the evening; for she deferred the exercises of Tuesday afternoon until the next day. Accordingly, on Wednesday at three o'clock the University bell summoned to Disputations in Divinity and Law. Profiting by the annoyance on Monday, the Respondent, Mr. Hutton, Public Reader in Divinity, exhibited thirteen copies of his questions, one being delivered to her Majesty by Mr. Secretary, the others to the Noblemen by the Beadle. The propositions were:

1. Major est authoritas scripturae quam ecclesiae.
2. Civilis magistratus habet authoritatem in rebus ecclesiasticis.

Five of the oldest Doctors had been appointed "to oppugn the first question." These were Drs. Alford, Perne, Porey, Newton, and Baker. Apparently, to hurry the program, the Proctors pre-

termitted (cut out) Dr. Philip Baker and Dr. Francis Newton. When the Queen discovered this, she commanded them to dispute briefly.

Immediately following their arguments, the second question was taken up by two Doctors out of the five who had been appointed; namely, Drs. Stokes, Beaumont, Goodman, Kelke, and Maye. By the time they "were stayed," it was seven o'clock. In spite of the lateness of the hour, time was granted to hear the solemn determination of the questions by "The Reverend Father in God, Richard Cox, Lord Bishop of Ely, sitting in his Bishop's weed, between Mr. Secretary and the Vice-Chancellor."

The Divines, having used up all of the afternoon with their disputations, had left no time for the lawyers. Their Respondent must have been sorely nettled, for he had made ready to defend two questions, and he was the Queen's own Reader. These questions were:

1. Privatus quilibet, ut munus publicum subeat, cogi potest.
2. Mutuans pecuniam, ludenti aleae, non potest repetere.[6]

Against Dr. Clarke were pitted Drs. Hervey, Busby, and Hall. Although her Majesty "eftsoons" asked for the Lawyers, and expressed a desire to hear them, everybody must have known that her remarks were only a courtly gesture.

Instead of this legal disputation, which would doubtless have kept the assembly supperless until midnight, and would have interfered with the performance of *Ajax Flagellifer,* in Latin, by the students, the Queen herself was importuned to make a concluding speech to the program in the Latin tongue. At first she refused, saying "That if she might speak her mind in English, she would not stick at the matter." But when she was informed by Mr. Secretary "that nothing might be said openly to the University in English," she asked him to speak, "because he was Chancellor, and the Chancellor is the Queen's mouth." Cecil replied "that he was chancellor of the University and not hers." Finally, seeing the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Robert Dudley, the Secretary, and the Bishop of Ely, all kneeling, and the latter crying "That three

[6] A different wording occurs in another account:
1. An quilibet privatus possit cogi alumnus publicum.
2. An pecunia mutata in lusu aleae possit fine repeti.

words of her mouth were enough," she graciously gave way and "presentlye made a very eloquent, sententious, and comfortable Oracion in Latin." (The following translation is made from a combination of the three Latin versions.)

"My very dear University and my most faithful subjects: Although my feminine modesty might deter me from making a speech and uttering these rude, off-hand remarks in so great an assembly of most learned men, nevertheless the intercession of my nobles and my own goodwill toward the University have prevailed upon me to say something. Two motives inspire me to speak at this time: the first is the increase of Good Letters, something which I desire very much and which I seek for with most earnest prayers; the other is the expectation, so I understand of all of you.

"As to what concerns the increase of Good Letters, I recall this statement of Demosthenes: 'that the words of superiors take the place of books among inferiors, while the sayings and good examples of leaders are regarded as legal authority among the subjects.' Accordingly, if this be true, and if they regarded it as true in their republic, how much more so is it in a kingdom. I would have all of you bear this one thing in mind, that no road is straighter, none shorter, none more adapted to win the good things of fortune or the good-will of your Prince, than the pursuit of Good Letters; which, may you continue diligently as you have begun, I pray and beseech you.

"As to the second motive, your expectations, I will indeed say this one thing: that I would have let nothing go by more gladly, because your benevolent minds harbor thoughts so far beyond me.

"Now I come to the University. This morning I saw your sumptuous buildings, which were erected by my ancestors, most distinguished princes, for the sake of Letters. And while looking at them, grief took possession of me and those sighings of the soul which are said to have gripped Alexander the Great, who, when he had surveyed the mighty deeds of his fathers, turned to a friend or counsellor and grieved deeply because he lived in a time later than theirs and hence inferior in virtue. So I, when I beheld your splendid buildings and magnificent colleges, was seized with a deep sorrow because I have done nothing yet of this kind, because I was inferior to them in this matter. But only a few years have

termitted (cut out) Dr. Philip Baker and Dr. Francis Newton. When the Queen discovered this, she commanded them to dispute briefly.

Immediately following their arguments, the second question was taken up by two Doctors out of the five who had been appointed; namely, Drs. Stokes, Beaumont, Goodman, Kelke, and Maye. By the time they "were stayed," it was seven o'clock. In spite of the lateness of the hour, time was granted to hear the solemn determination of the questions by "The Reverend Father in God, Richard Cox, Lord Bishop of Ely, sitting in his Bishop's weed, between Mr. Secretary and the Vice-Chancellor."

The Divines, having used up all of the afternoon with their disputations, had left no time for the lawyers. Their Respondent must have been sorely nettled, for he had made ready to defend two questions, and he was the Queen's own Reader. These questions were:

1. Privatus quilibet, ut munus publicum subeat, cogi potest.
2. Mutuans pecuniam, ludenti aleae, non potest repetere.[6]

Against Dr. Clarke were pitted Drs. Hervey, Busby, and Hall. Although her Majesty "eftsoons" asked for the Lawyers, and expressed a desire to hear them, everybody must have known that her remarks were only a courtly gesture.

Instead of this legal disputation, which would doubtless have kept the assembly supperless until midnight, and would have interfered with the performance of *Ajax Flagellifer*, in Latin, by the students, the Queen herself was importuned to make a concluding speech to the program in the Latin tongue. At first she refused, saying "That if she might speak her mind in English, she would not stick at the matter." But when she was informed by Mr. Secretary "that nothing might be said openly to the University in English," she asked him to speak, "because he was Chancellor, and the Chancellor is the Queen's mouth." Cecil replied "that he was chancellor of the University and not hers." Finally, seeing the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Robert Dudley, the Secretary, and the Bishop of Ely, all kneeling, and the latter crying "That three

[6] A different wording occurs in another account:
1. An quilibet privatus possit cogi alumnus publicum.
2. An pecunia mutata in lusu aleae possit fine repeti.

words of her mouth were enough," she graciously gave way and "presentlye made a very eloquent, sententious, and comfortable Oracion in Latin." (The following translation is made from a combination of the three Latin versions.)

"My very dear University and my most faithful subjects: Although my feminine modesty might deter me from making a speech and uttering these rude, off-hand remarks in so great an assembly of most learned men, nevertheless the intercession of my nobles and my own goodwill toward the University have prevailed upon me to say something. Two motives inspire me to speak at this time: the first is the increase of Good Letters, something which I desire very much and which I seek for with most earnest prayers; the other is the expectation, so I understand of all of you.

"As to what concerns the increase of Good Letters, I recall this statement of Demosthenes: 'that the words of superiors take the place of books among inferiors, while the sayings and good examples of leaders are regarded as legal authority among the subjects.' Accordingly, if this be true, and if they regarded it as true in their republic, how much more so is it in a kingdom. I would have all of you bear this one thing in mind, that no road is straighter, none shorter, none more adapted to win the good things of fortune or the good-will of your Prince, than the pursuit of Good Letters; which, may you continue diligently as you have begun, I pray and beseech you.

"As to the second motive, your expectations, I will indeed say this one thing: that I would have let nothing go by more gladly, because your benevolent minds harbor thoughts so far beyond me.

"Now I come to the University. This morning I saw your sumptuous buildings, which were erected by my ancestors, most distinguished princes, for the sake of Letters. And while looking at them, grief took possession of me and those sighings of the soul which are said to have gripped Alexander the Great, who, when he had surveyed the mighty deeds of his fathers, turned to a friend or counsellor and grieved deeply because he lived in a time later than theirs and hence inferior in virtue. So I, when I beheld your splendid buildings and magnificent colleges, was seized with a deep sorrow because I have done nothing yet of this kind, because I was inferior to them in this matter. But only a few years have

passed since we began to reign, nor is our age so old that we may not be able to accomplish something.

"This common maxim cheers me a little, and although it cannot remove my pain, at least it lessens my sorrow. It is this: 'Rome was not built in a day.' And while the thought of Alexander disturbs me a great deal, I hope, before rendering up my account to Nature (if Atropos do not cut off the thread of my life too quickly), to accomplish some work of importance. And while life remains in my body, I will never be turned from my purpose. And if it should happen (how quickly it may occur I am unable to say) that I must die before I am able to complete this thing which I promise, nevertheless I will leave behind after my death some monument of distinction, by which my memory may be renowned and by which others may be incited by my example. And I will make all of you more diligent in the pursuit of your studies.

"But now you perceive how great is the difference between a true education and a training not retained in the mind. Of the first you yourselves are so many sufficient proofs; of the other I have, too inconsiderately indeed, made you all at this time witnesses. Now it is time that your ears, detained so long by this barbarous kind of oration, be released from boredom. I have spoken."

"Marvelously astonied" at her speech the auditors, especially when they sensed what she had promised, broke forth into "Vivat Regina." She, however, said in respect to her speech, "Taceat Regina." And she wished "That all they that heard her Oration had drunk of the flood of Lethe." So wearied was she with listening for hours to disputations and orations in the daytime and to plays at night that she begged off from attending the tragedy of Sophocles, called *Ajax Flagellifer*, in Latin, although the students had made great preparations and spent much money in the production; whereat there was "great sorrow, not only of the players, but of all the whole University."

The next morning, after she had mounted her horse, preparatory to leaving Cambridge, Mr. Clarke, her Reader in Law, who had not been given an opportunity to dispute the day before on account of the lateness of the hour, handed his speech to her Majesty in writing. Whether she ever read his disputation is not known; but certain it is that, as she left the town, preceded by the

Mayor and the whole body of Aldermen, some very distinguished Doctors on their knees wished her Grace, in Latin, a prosperous and safe Progress; to whom she answered in a loud voice, "Valete Omnes."

ENGLISH RHETORIC REVERTS TO CLASSICISM, 1600-1650

WILLIAM P. SANDFORD
University of Illinois

Rhetorica est ars ornati dicendi. Partes Rhetoricae duae sunt: Elocutio & Pronunciatio.—Charles Butler, in *Rhetoricae Libri Duo,* Oxford, 1598.

Oratoria est Facultas formandi Orationem de qualibet Quaestione.—Charles Butler, in *Oratoriae Libri Duo,* Oxford, 1629.

PROPERLY understood and interpreted, the foregoing quotations from Butler represent, respectively, the sixteenth- and seventeenth- century points of view of English rhetoricians concerning the nature of public speaking. Sixteenth-century Englishmen, typically, thought of rhetoric as the art of embellishing speech by means of *elocutio*—style, particularly figures and tropes —and *pronunciatio*—oral delivery. By the middle of the seventeenth century, although the stylistic tradition was still influential, they thought of rhetoric as the faculty of planning speeches upon any subject with the end of persuasion. In short, they had reverted to the classical concept so well phrased by Aristotle, that rhetoric is the art of finding the available means of persuasion in any case.

Butler's shift in terminology, from *rhetorica* to *oratoria,* should not mislead the reader. It was made, apparently, for the sake of maintaining a surface consistency between his two works, separated by approximately thirty years. Thus he explains in the foreword to *Oratoriae Libri Duo* that whereas *rhetoric* is concerned with the ornamentation of speech, oratory has to do with persuasion; that the parts of the former are *elocutio* and *pronun-*

ciatio, whereas those of the latter are *inventio, dispositio,* and *memoria.* But in *Oratoriae Libri Duo* he lists *elocutio* and *pronunciatio* as parts of the subject, referring the reader to his rhetoric for their treatment. Moreover, in the earlier work he deals throughout with style and delivery as if they constituted the whole of the speaker's art. The fact is that Butler changed his point of view from the stylistic to the classical; and in that change he typifies the too periods which his life overlapped. English theories of public address as a whole made a similar change from the stylistic (the rhetoric of "exornation") to the classical in the period from 1600 to 1650. It is with that change, and with some of its causes, that this paper will deal.

ENGLISH STUDY OF CLASSICISM

Although for practical purposes it may be said that English rhetoric in the latter part of the sixteenth century dealt primarily with style and delivery, that statement is subject to considerable modification. True it is that subsequent to the rhetorics of Wilson, 1553, and Rainolde, 1562, practically all of the English works on the subject until 1600 dealt with style and delivery; there were, nevertheless, many scholars and teachers who were studying the classical sources, and, in sympathy with them, laying stress upon the importance of *inventio* and *dispositio.*

Herrick[1] has traced the early history of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in England, and has unearthed much material of importance concerning the study of the subject in the Universities. That Vives lectured at Oxford *circa* 1523, and may have acquainted his English associates and students with Aristotle's *Rhetoric;* that Aristotle's *Elenchi,* Cicero, Quintilian, and Hermogenes were in use at Cambridge as early as 1549 (probably Cicero was represented by the *De Inventione* or the pseudo-Ciceronian *ad Herennium,* and not by *De Oratore);* and that John Jewel, who had been appointed Reader in Rhetoric at Oxford shortly after 1540, revealed in his *Oratio contra Rhetoricam*[2] a considerable acquaintance with the standard rhetorical treatises, all indicate that in the Universities the classical point of view was known early in the century.

[1] HERRICK, MARVIN T., "The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England," *Philological Quarterly,* V. 3, pp. 242-257.

[2] Cf. translation by HUDSON, H. H., *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XIV, 3, pp. 374-392.

Between 1570 and 1600, the period in which stylistic rhetoric was apparently dominant, the University study of classical works continued. Apparently by 1570 the *De Oratore*, Cicero's greatest work, and the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle were known to scholars, for Roger Ascham says:

> The best book that ever Tully wrote, by all men's judgment, and by his own testimony too, in writing whereof he employed most care, study, learning, and judgment, is the book *de Oratore ad Q. Fratrem*.... And first, for the matter, it is whole Aristotle's, whatsoever Antony in the second and Crassus in the third doth teach. Trust not me, but believe Trully himself, who writeth so.
>
> Paraphrasis of Brocardus or Sambucus shall never take Aristotle's *Rhetorick* nor Horace *de Arte Poetica* out of learned men's hand.[3]

Jebb states, "At Cambridge in 1570 the study of rhetoric was based on Quintilian, Hermogenes, and the speeches of Cicero viewed as works of art. An Oxford statute of 1588 shows that the same works were used there."[4]

The Ciceronianism of Gabriel Harvey, who lectured at Cambridge before 1576 and who published *Rhetor* in 1577, is well known. Likewise the work of John Reynolds, who was appointed Reader in Greek at Oxford in 1572-1573, is a matter of common knowledge. He lectured on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, and at his death in 1607 left behind him the unpublished commentary—*Commentarii in tres. lib. Arist. de Rhetorica.* Reynolds' copy of the 1562 (Paris) edition of the *Rhetoric*, with interleaved comments by him, is still in the Bodleian Library. Herrick, who has examined it, states that it shows a thorough knowledge of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, et al.

Thus through the sixteenth century the great classical rhetoricians were studied and discussed in the Universities; this in spite of the predominant interest elsewhere in purely ornamental rhetoric. Nor did Reynold's death in 1607 mean the end of Aristotelian studies at Oxford. Barton Holyday, praelector of Rhetoric and Philosophy in Christ Church College from about 1617 to 1621, treated the *Rhetoric* in his lectures. These, published in

[3] ASCHAM, ROGER, *Works*, III, 217, and III, 201-202, respectively, quoted by Herrick, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

[4] JEBB, R. C., art. *Rhetoric*, Encyc. Brit. 9th ed.

1633, concern the *De Anima*, the *Ethics*, and the *Rhetoric*. A small commentary on the second book of the *Rhetoric* (aptly called by Baldwin "the book of the audience") was dedicated by one "Jo Hardinge" to W. Langton, President of Magdalen College from 1610 to 1626.[5] And in 1619 the first edition of the *Rhetoric* in England was published, edited by Theodore Goulston, the *Versio Latina et Paraphrasis in Aristotelis Rhetoricam*. Goulston's edition was followed in 1637 (?) by the English paraphrase written by Thomas Hobbes (reviewed in the section following), which was reprinted in 1681, by another translation (author unknown), *Aristotle's Rhetorick, or the True Grounds and Principles of Oratory; shewing the Right art of Pleading and Speaking in full assemblies, and Courts of Judicature*, London, 1686, 1693; and by a Greek-Latin edition, London, 1696.[6]

Cicero's *De Oratore* had been printed by J. Kingston in 1573, and another edition had appeared at Cambridge in 1593. Thomas Cockman edited an edition at Oxford in 1696, this being reprinted in 1700. Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory, edited* "a Dan. Paraeo," was printed at London in 1641, and again in 1662. John Hall's translation of "Longinus" *De Sublimitate* appeared at London in 1652, and another translation, by "J. P. G. S.," appeared in 1680.[7] In short, the principal works of classical antiquity were available to English scholars by about the middle of the century, in editions published in England.

Grammar school practice in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is too complex a subject to review here in detail. Contrary to general opinion, however, rhetorical instruction was *not* limited to matters of style, as one would think from reading the most frequently-quoted passage from John Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius*, 1612.[8] That is to the effect that pupils were required to memorize the figures and tropes out of Talaeus or Butler (the *Rhetoricae Libri Duo)*. We find also that *inventio* was taught, principally according to the logical topics of Aphthonius, and that the declamation, or stock exercise in invention, as explained by Hermogenes, and in England by Rainolde, was used as a vehicle

[5] HERRICK, *op. cit.*, p. 257.
[6] Cf. WATTS, *Bibliotheca Britannica*, I, art. *Aristotle*.
[7] Cf. WATTS, *op. cit.*, articles on Quintilian, Cicero, "Longinus."
[8] BRINSLEY, JOHN, *Ludus Literarius*, ed. Campagnac, 1917, pp. 203-204.

of instruction. *Dispositio* was also taught.[9] Again, delivery was given considerable attention. Students were drilled in articulation, expression according to meaning, and emphasis.[10]. In short, grammar-school instruction was better rounded and more complete than would be apparent from the statement that students were drilled in the use of figures and tropes. Whatever the teachers' theories regarding the relation between "logic" *(inventio* and *dispositio)* and "rhetoric" *(elocutio* and *prounciatio)*, the fact is that pupils were drilled, not only in figures of speech and delivery, but also in the formulation of arguments and in their arrangement in the speech.[11]

CONTINENTAL RHETORICS

Enough evidence has been cited, perhaps, to show that Englishmen in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were coming to know the classical tradition of rhetoric. No doubt the result of these studies would ultimately have been a renaissance of classical theory in English-written books; but this development was hastened by two factors: the works of continental rhetoricians and the suggestions of Francis Bacon. With the former we shall deal briefly in this section. English rhetorics from 1620 on are full of citations to the works we shall mention, and it may be said in passing that detailed examination of these works, plus a careful study of their influence on English writers, should be undertaken as a major piece of research. Synopsis is all that is possible here. Among the continental works most cited by English writers are:

1. *Rhetorica Inventionis, Dispositionis, Elocutionis* of MATTHEW DRESSER, Leipsic, 1584. This work, according to Gibert, shows the influence of Luther and Melanchthon, and is a learned treatise rather than a textbook. To the conventional three types of oratory Dresser adds the oratory of instruction, which, he believes, is as necessary in religion as in education. With this exception, he follows Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.[12]

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 172-173; 173-190.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 212-214.

[11] For further confirmation of this point, cf. WATSON, FOSTER, *The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England*, London, 1909, p. 44, and HOOLE, *New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School*, 1660, quoted by WATSON, F., *The Old Grammar Schools*, pp. 105, 109, *et passim*.

[12] GIBERT, *Jugemens des Savans sur les Auteurs qui ont traité de la Rhetorique*, Amsterdam, 1725, pp. 215, 216.

2. *Systema Rhetoricae of* BARTHOLOMEW KECKERMAN, Dantzig, 1606. Keckerman divides his work into two parts; the first dealing with general principles of rhetoric, in which he treats logical invention, style, and delivery, the second dealing with "special" features of the subject, in which he treats the several kinds of speeches, including speeches of explanation and instruction, the moving of the passions, the three types of style, the use of exercises, etc. Save for the modification in order, and the introduction of expository speeches, his point of view is classical.[13]

3. The rhetoric of CYPRIAN SOAREZ, Jesuit, ca. 1600. This school text is one of the earliest of Jesuit works, and is typical of its kind. In his preface, Soarez announces as a leading principle that "eloquence and reason are but one and the same thing," or at least, that "eloquence is entirely founded on reason, that it is one of the products of logical thinking." The book is a condensation of classical doctrine, based upon the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian in the main. Gibert criticizes it adversely only in respect to its treatment of amplification, which, he thinks, is not sufficiently detailed, and in respect to its treatment of the passions.[14]

4. *Theatrum Rhetoricum of* CRESOL, another Jesuit. This, historical and philosophical in its nature, reviewed, in five books, the history of rhetorical theory. It is of interest in that it shows the wide acquaintance with classical authors on the basis of which Jesuit rhetoric developed. Cresol also wrote *Les vacances,* a book in four parts treating of action and pronunciation. This is significant of another important aspect of Jesuit rhetoric, the expanded treatment of delivery. Although the Jesuits preserved the classical emphasis upon *inventio,* they treated delivery more after the fashion of the modern inclusive text on composition and delivery than in the cursory manner of the ancients.[15]

5. *Eloquentia Sacra et Humana, Libri. XVI;* by NICHOLAS CAUSSIN, 1619. This 1010-page work(and the pages are 8¾x7") represents Jesuit scholarship and pedagogy combined. It is exhaustive in its treatment of the history, theory, and practice of

[13] KECKERMAN, B., *Systema Rhetoricae,* Dantzig, 1606, Table of contents, pp. 6-8.

[14] GIBERT, *op. cit.,* pp. 230-232.

[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 232-234.

oratory, and served as a mine of classical references for later writers, particularly English. Among the thirteen Greek rhetoricians cited by Caussin are Aristotle, Demetrius Phalereus, Aristides, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Hermogenes, Aphthonius and Theon; among the seventeen Latins, Cicero, Quintilian, Capella, Aquila Romanus, and Marius Victorius. Sophists, philologists, philosophers, historians, fathers of the Church, and orators are cited. The author had for his time an astounding knowledge, not only of ancient rhetoric and oratory, but of patristic, medieval, and Renaissance theory and practice. On the side of theory, Caussin treats *inventio* and the *loci* of invention, *amplificatio, dispositio* and the parts of the oration, style and figures, the passions, delivery, epideictic oratory, deliberative or civil oratory, and sacred oratory. All are developed with a wealth of classical citations.[16]

Other Jesuit writers who might be mentioned are Pelletier, who wrote the rather fantastic *Palatium Eloquentiae,* which likened the various steps in rhetorical theory to the parts of a building, and Dy Cygne, who wrote on Cicero's oratory and who was the author of a text written in the form of questions and answers. In general, Jesuit rhetoricians followed classical doctrines rather closely, considering the five canons, the three kinds of proof, the three constant purposes of the orator, and the traditional parts of the speech. To the three kinds of oratory they added, of course, sacred eloquence, sometimes, like Caussin, telescoping the classical deliberative and judicial oratory into "civil" eloquence. René Rapin, later in the century, was another Jesuit author of importance, but of course his *Reflexions sur L'Eloquence, La Poetique, L'Histoire, et La Philosophie,* 1672, is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

6. The works of Gerard Jean Vossius. Vossius was practically as influential as Caussin. Among his works, the *Rhetorices Contractae, sive partitionum oratoriarum, libri. v., circa* 1606, and published at Oxford in 1631, an elementary text, was widely used in English grammar schools. His *Commentaries on Rhetoric,* Leyden, 1622, was an erudite discussion of classical theories. This, too, was widely used as a source of citations by English writers.[17]

[16] CAUSSIN, NICHOLAS, *Eloquentia Sacra et Humana, Libri XVI, editio octava,* 1681.

[17] GIBERT, *op. cit.,* p. 250 ff. reviews the works of Vossius.

So much for a brief résumé of the more important continental works which influenced English rhetoric of the early seventeenth century. It is impossible here to do more than sketch the nature of their influence. That it was predominantly classical in doctrine, and that it was an important factor in the English reaction against the tradition of ornamental rhetoric, cannot be doubted. The citations made by English writers beginning in 1619 furnish evidence of this influence. This is particularly true in the works of such writers as Vicars, Farnaby, Butler, and Pemble.

THE INFLUENCE OF BACON

Francis Bacon, early in the century, criticized the excessive attention to style of which writers and speakers of the Elizabethan age were guilty:

> This grew speedily to an excesse; for men began to hunt more after wordes than matter, and more after the choiseness of the Phrase and the round and cleane composition of the sentence, and the sweet falling of the clauses, than after the weight of matter, worth of subject, soundness of argument, life of invention, or depth of judgement.[18]

It was, however, in his *Advancement of Learning,* II, 1623, that Bacon made his greatest contributions to the development of rhetorical theory. He not only called attention to classical works, but stressed what was at that time almost a forgotten part of Aristotle's doctrine, namely, the adaptation of the speech to the specific audience; and in addition, he composed his "colours of good and evil," his *antitheta,* and his *formulae.*

To the clarification of the doctrine of rhetorical invention, Bacon contributed the thought that it is a recovery or resummoning of what the speaker already knows, and that its scope is "readiness and present use of our knowledge, and not addition or amplification thereof." In expressing this opinion, he departs from Aristotle, but fortifies his position by referring to the actual practice of Cicero and Demosthenes.[19]

The *antitheta* and *formulae* were accordingly proposed to furnish "provision or preparatory store for the furniture of speech and readiness of invention, which appeareth to be of two

[18] BACON, *Advancement of Learning,* 1605, in Spingarn, *Crit. Essays 17th Century,* I, 2.

[19] *Adv. Learn. II,* XIII, 6. Tr. F. G. Selby, 1893.

sorts; the one in resemblance to a shop of pieces unmade up, the other to a shop of things ready made up; both to be applied to that which is frequent and most in request. The former of these I will call *antitheta*, and the latter *formulae.*"[20] The *antitheta* were stock arguments for and against various propositions, which Bacon said were not to be used in the form in which he put them, but as the bases for elaborate arguments: "not to be cited, but to be as skeins or bottoms of thread, to be unwinded at large when they came to be used; supplying authorities and examples by reference."

FOR THE LETTER OF THE LAW.

Interpretation which recedes from the letter is not interpretation, but divination:
When the judge recedes from the letter, he becomes a legislator.

FOR THE INTENTION OF THE LAW.

We must gather from all the words taken together the sense in which each is to be interpreted.[21]

The *formulae* he explains as follows:

> *Formulae* are but decent and apt passages or conveyances of speech, which may serve indifferently for differing subjects; as of preface, conclusion, digression, transition, excusation, &c. For as in buildings there is great pleasure and use in the well casting of the staircases, entries, doors, windows, and the like; so in speech, the conveyances and passages are of special ornament and effect."

A CONCLUSION IN A DELIBERATIVE.

So may we redeem the faults passed, and prevent the inconveniences future.[22]

The "colours of good and evil" consisted of sophisms and their refutations. Bacon shrewdly observed that these are useful, not only for proof, but also for (emotional) impression.[23]

Such were Bacon's collections of commonplaces, hailed by Jebb as "perhaps one of the most notable modern contributions to the art [of rhetoric]."[24] Whether or not Jebb's evaluation is correct, it is certain that Bacon influenced many writers of rhetorics to add to their works long lists of commonplaces. Farnaby, Clark, and Blount are among such authors.

[20] BACON, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 7.
[21] *Ibid.*, XVIII, 8.
[22] BACON, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 9.
[23] *Ibid.*, XVIII, 6.
[24] JEBB, R. C., art., *Rhetoric*, Encyc. Brit., ninth ed.

Probably more significant in the general history of rhetoric, however, is the impetus which Bacon gave to the reaction toward classicism. Notwithstanding the fact that he found ancient rhetoric deficient in respect to commonplaces, he, on the whole, praised classical authors. Speaking of the value of rhetoric, and of the contributions made by the ancients, he says,

> Now we descend to that part which concerneth the illustration of tradition, comprehended in that science which we call rhetoric, or art of eloquence; a science excellent, and excellently well laboured. For although in true value it is inferior to wisdom, as it is said by God to Moses, when he disabled him for want of this faculty, *Aaron shall be thy speaker and thou shalt be to him as God;* yet with people it is the more mighty, for so Salomon saith, *The wise in heart shall be called prudent, but sweetness of speech attains greater things;* signifying that profoundness of wisdom will help a man to a name or admiration, but that it is eloquence that prevaileth in an active life. And as to the labouring of it, the emulation of Aristotle with the rhetoricians of his time, and the experience of Cicero, hath made them in their works of rhetorics exceed themselves. Again, the excellency of examples of eloquence in the orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, added to the perfection of the precepts of eloquence, hath doubled the progression in this art; and therefore the deficiencies which I shall note will rather be in some collections [the *antitheta*, etc.] which may as handmaids attend the art, than in the rules or use of the art itself.
>
> Notwithstanding, to stir the earth a little about the roots of this science, as we have done of the rest; the duty and office of rhetoric is to apply reason to imagination for the better moving of the will. . . .[25]

After a philosophical defense of rhetoric against Plato's charge that it was "mere cookery," Bacon presents his dictum concerning adaptation to the audience, which was to prove highly influential in the works of later writers:

> . . . Aristotle doth wisely place rhetoric as between logic on the one side, and moral or civil knowledge on the other, as participating of both: for the proofs and demonstrations of logic are toward all men indifferent and the same; but the proofs and persuasions of rhetoric ought to differ according to the auditors. . . . Which application, in perfection of idea, ought to extend so far, that if a man should speak of the same thing to several persons, he should speak to them all respective-

[25] BACON, *op. cit.* XVIII, 1, 2.

> ly and several ways: though this politic part of eloquence in private speech it is easy for the greatest orators to want. . . .[26]

Farnaby, Butler, and Pemble, writing within the decade after the *Advancement of Learning, II,* show the effects of Bacon's emphasis upon pathetic proof. When it is recalled that no English writer since Thomas Wilson, 1553, had dealt with the passions in any systematic manner, and that Wilson reduced pathetic proof to a subheading under Amplification, the full significance of Bacon's observations becomes apparent. The writers mentioned above stress pathetic proof with Aristotelian emphasis.

Thus Bacon not only aided in the revival and strengthening of classical doctrine in general, but he set in motion two important trains of thought: attention to the audience (pathetic proof), and the value of commonplaces as aids to invention. A third tendency, of the connection of which with rhetoric he does not seem to have been aware, was the study of gestures. In speaking of the science of physiognomy, he said:

> . . . Aristotle hath very ingeniously and diligently handled the factures of the body, but not the gestures of the body, which are no less comprehensible by art, and of greater use and advantage. For the lineaments of the body do disclose the disposition and inclination of the mind in general: but the motions of the countenance and parts do not only so, but do further disclose the present humour and state of the mind and will. . . . As the tongue speaketh to the ear so the gestures speaketh to the eye. And therefore a number of subtile persons, whose eyes do dwell upon the faces and fashions of men, do well know the advantage of this observation. . . .[27]

John Bulwer, in 1644, seized upon this passage as a suggestion for his *Chirologia* and *Chironomia,* the first elaborate treatment of the art of gesture in the language. But Bacon's notion, obviously, was that physiognomy and gesture should be studied in order to be able to read the minds of men; not in order to become better speakers.

ENGLISH RHETORICS SHOWING CLASSICAL INFLUENCE

Even before Bacon's pronunciamento of 1623, the classical tradition had begun to reassert itself in England, as we have seen.

[26] BACON, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 5.
[27] BACON, *op. cit.* IX, 2.

After Bacon, however, there are distinct indications of his influence, in addition to that of the continental rhetoricians.

THOMAS VICAR'S *Manuductio ad Artem Rhetoricam,* 1619. This small handbook of rhetoric, consisting of 128 pages, and arranged in the form of questions and answers, is said by Clark to have "all the air of a novelty. Yet all he does is to return to the classical tradition."[28] Since, however, Vicars did his work at Queens college in Oxford, and was therefore in contact with the Aristotelian movement there, it is probable that he did not regard his work as novel. He was trying to state the full classical doctrine in a manner readily comprehensible to young students. Of eight chapters, one is given to a definition of rhetoric and of its parts; one each to demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial orations; one to disposition, one to style, and one to memory and pronunciation. The first sixty pages are occupied by the four chapters relating to invention; six pages are given to disposition; seventeen to style; and seven to memory and delivery. There is a five-page epilogue, and an oration given in Queens College occupies the remaining space.

Vicars defines rhetoric as "*ars recte et ornate dicendi,*" quoting Quintilian and Soarez as authorities, and for his definition of the five parts of the subject he cites Quintilian, Dresser, Soarez, Sturmius, and St. Augustine.[29] These, with Keckerman and Vossius, are his principal sources throughout his work. While his definition of rhetoric smacks of the stylistic tradition, his treatment of the five parts, and the relative emphasis which he gives to them, are quite in accordance with the classical practice.

THOMAS FARNABY'S *Index Rhetoricus,* 1625.[30] Significant because of its classical content, its *formulae,* and its long vogue, is this work of 1625. It is a highly compact, inclusive treatment of the subject, more nearly approaching the thoroughness of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian than any of its English predecessors. Significant of Bacon's influence is Farnaby's list of commonplaces, or

[28] CLARK, D. L., *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance,* New York, 1922, p. 61.

[29] VICARS, THOMAS, *Manuductio ad Artem Rhetoricam,* p. 1.

[30] *Index Rhetoricus et Oratorius Scholiis et Institutione tenioris Aetatis accomodatus, cui adjiciuntur Formulae Oratoriae et Index Poeticus.* Editions: 1625, 1633, 1634 (?), 1640, 1646, 1648, 1654, 1659-63, 1696, 1704.

heads of argument, and of *formulae*, which, in the edition of 1704, occupy pp. 56-120. Also significant of his influence is the attention given to pathetic proof, or, in other words, the appeal to the emotions of the audience. While the book is small and the treatment highly condensed, partly by means of elaborate diagrams showing the different divisions of the subject, it cannot be dismissed merely as a textbook. Farnaby shows a philosophical grasp of his subject-matter, and his discussion is fortified by citations to a distinguished list of authorities. Clark justly remarks that the growth of classical knowledge in England is nowhere better illustrated than by the differences in the sources of Wilson (1553) and Farnaby. To quote him:

> Wilson knew and used Cicero, Quintilian, Plutarch, Basil the Great, and Erasmus. Farnaby cites an imposing list of sources:
>
> 'Greek: Aristotle, Hermogenes, Sopatrus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Demetrius Phalereus, Menander, Aristides, Apsinus, Longinus *De Sublimitate*, Theonus, Aphthonius. Latin: Cicero, Quintilian, Maritanus Capella, Curio Fortunatus, Mario Victorino, Victore, Emporio, Augustanio, Ruffinus, Trapezuntius, P. Ramus, L. Vives, Soarez, J. C. Scaliger, Sturm, Strebaeus, Keckermann, Alstedius, N. Caussinus, J. G. Voss, A. Valladero.'
>
> Whether Farnaby had read the works of these gentlemen through from cover to cover is another matter. He at least knew their names, and had read in Vossius, whose footnotes would refer him to all these sources as well as to others, both classical and medieval.[31]

Farnaby's treatment shows throughout the spirit of the classical authors. A review of his text material, which occupies pp. 1-56 in the edition of 1704, will reveal his point of view.

First, he defines rhetoric and its aims in a manner truly Quintilianian:

> *Rhetorica est facultas de unaquaque re dicendi bene, & ad persuadendum accomodata: Officium est Delectare, Docere, Concitare, ad conciliationem, fidem, movendos affectus, gratia suavitas, necessitas, victoriae, ubi requiritur orationis lenitas, acumen, vis.*[32]

According to Farnaby, the material of rhetoric is any matter

[31] CLARK, *op. cit.* p. 68. The quotation is from Farnaby's preface.
[32] FARNABY, *Index Rhetoricus*, Edition 1704, p. 7.

which may be the subject of persuasion, and the three kinds of oratory are the demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial.

Evidence that the work, although compact, has a philosophical trend, is found in Farnaby's discussion of the media of oratory. These he classifies according to their sources, as follows:

> From nature: physical [sonorous voice, bodily health]; mental [ingenuity, acuteness, sagacity, memory, which *"a Natura & Exercitatione potius est quam ab Arte,"* judgment, discretion].
>
> From art: invention, *"quae excogitat argumenta ad persuadendem idonea,"* disposition, *"quae res inventu discernit, atque per partes distribuit,"* elocution, "quae res inventas *dispositasque exornat flore verborum, & lumine sententiarunt,"* and pronunciation, *"quae cum vocis apta modulatione & corporis gestu orationem profert.*
>
> From practice, *"quae assiduitate Legendi Commentandi, Scribendi, Variandi, Imitandi, & Dicendi Naturam Artemque perfecit."*

It is to be noted that he omits memory from the traditional list of the parts of the art of rhetoric. In this, he is following the leadership of Vossius.

Farnaby's treatment of invention demonstrates his grasp of classical theory. The first grand division of proofs is the Aristotelian one between artificial and inartificial arguments. Artificial arguments are divided into four classes: (1) those directed to conviction of a logical type, *"ex locis docentibus,"* of which those of certain demonstration are referred to the places of logic and dialectic, and those of probability are referred to rhetoric; (2) Those *"ex locis patheticis,"* which deal in affections, such as love, hate, etc., (3) Those intended for the purpose of conciliation, which deal (a) with the orator, who must have wisdom, honesty, benevolence, and modesty, and (b) with the nation, according to its form of government; (4) Those framed with a view to the auditors, as they differ in emotions, habits of virtue and vice, age, and condition. The inartificial proofs include divine testimony, oracles, proverbs, etc., just as in the discussion by Aristotle.[34] It is to be noted that Farnaby includes in this tabulation *all* of the classical notions of proof, logical, ethical, and pathetic, and that without

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[34] FARNABY, *op. cit.* p. 9.

doubt he has consulted the first and second books of Aristotle. The influence of Bacon is here clearly demonstrated, in that Farnaby includes adaptation to the hearers in his consideration of invention. No English rhetorician since Wilson had given much attention to pathetic proof; Farnaby gives it great emphasis.

Disposition is treated by Farnaby as primarily the exercise of judgment in selecting the best order and method of presenting the speaker's ideas. He thinks that the orator, in arranging his speech, should follow either the principles of art, prescribed by Nature, which would mean to have a preface, narration, proposition, proof, refutation, and conclusion; or that he should follow the dictates of judgment, which would, according to the circumstances, lead him to omit or transpose the several parts. Book II of *De Oratore* is cited as his source for these ideas; he might likewise have cited Quintilian's discussion of disposition.[35] The six parts of the speech mentioned as those "prescribed by Nature" are given extended treatment. Amplification is treated under the confirmation. Various topics are given to assist the speaker in amplifying his ideas. Amplification by words is by means of illustration, superlative, asyndeton, iteration, relation, climax, synonym; by things, by means of increment, comparison, ratiocination, cause, effect, subject, adjunct, parts, etc. Farnaby emphasizes, in discussing the confirmation as a whole, the need of various kinds of proof. Here he repeats his discussion of the four headings given above, and adds a discussion of syllogisms and enthymemes.[36]

Style, according to Farnaby, consists of the qualities of elegance, composition, and dignity. Elegance depends upon purity and perspicuity; composition is a matter of juncture, order, periods, and numbers; dignity consists of ornateness (tropes and schemes) and aptness and variety of material. Ten pages are given to a discussion and illustration of various tropes.[37]

Delivery is treated in a cursory manner. Demosthenes' remarks on the importance of action, a few suggestions on accomodating the voice to the audience, and remarks on countenance and gesture, make up the two pages given to the subject.[38]

[35] FARNABY, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 17.
[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-23.
[37] FARNABY, *op. cit.*, p. 25 ff.
[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 44, 45.

Strikingly after the manner of Quintilian, Farnaby, in his discussion of *exercitatio,* and *imitatio,* outlines the education of the young orator, prescribing the order and nature of his studies, and specifying what orations are good models for imitation.[39] The commonplaces and *formulae* occupy the remainder of the book. At page 66, Farnaby offers a table of the *formulae,* which include material for the expression of all manner of transitions, summaries, etc., and for praise, interrogation, denunciation, etc. This table also includes "ornamenta et firmamenta," examples of the tropes and schemes.

In short, Farnaby's *Index Rhetoricus* lives up to its title. It is a convenient and inclusive summary of all that classical rhetoric, interpreted in all its phases by men of the late Renaissance, has had to say upon the subject of public speaking. In addition, it carries out the suggestions for *formulae* made by Francis Bacon. Moreover, its treatment is essentially sound. These facts help to explain the tremendous vogue of the book. It ran through successive editions, of which ten at least are known, from 1625 to 1704; it was used as a handbook in the grammar schools throughout the century. In short, it must be accounted the most significant English work on rhetoric which had appeared since that of Wilson. Probably no work of equal influence appeared until 1776, when George Campbell wrote his *Philosophy of Rhetoric.*[40]

CHARLES BUTLER'S *Oratoriae Libri Duo,* 1629. Evidence fully as emphatic that the seventeenth century was returning to classicism is found in the *Oratoriae Libri Duo* of Charles Butler, who in 1598 in his *Rhetoricae Libri Duo* had defined rhetoric as the "*ars ornati dicendi.*" Taken together, Butler's two works represent a complete treatment of the five canons of ancient rhetoric. The combined works enjoyed reprintings in 1633 and 1635, and according to Watts, were "often reprinted." Because of the fact that writers have ignored the *Oratoriae,* while discussing the *Rhe-*

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 45-56.

[40] Significant indication of the vogue and importance of the *Index Rhetoricus* is the fact that Gibert, *op. cit.*, 1725, pp. 247, 248, reviews it at some length. He, like Morhof, does not think well of the book, because he says it reduces the whole subject to mere outline. I have tried to show that, although it is a condensation, it presents classical theories in a sound and philosophical manner. It is less a textbook than an encyclopedia of reference.

toricae, Butler has gained the reputation of being primarily interested in style. Early in his career this was apparently the case, for his *Rhetoricae* belongs to the school of Talaeus, Fraunce, *et al.* But by 1629 he experienced a change of heart.

Not only does Butler admit in the *Oratoriae* the three canons of rhetoric which he formerly shunned, but his whole treatment of invention is shot through with the Aristotelian concept of the audience. This may have been because of the influence of Bacon; or it may have been the result of a scholarly acquaintance with the leading works of antiquity, for Butler cites time and again as his principal sources the "ad Theodecten," i. e., the *Rhetorica* of Aristotle, the *Institutes* of Quintilian, and the *De Oratore, Orator, De Partitione Oratorum,* and the *De Inventione* of Cicero. These, and occasionally the *Ad Herennium,* are his principal authorities, and his references, specific as to chapter and section, seem to indicate that he has gone directly to the classical sources.

In Book I, after the chapter of definitions and a short passage on diction, Butler plunges into a consideration of the means of persuasion. These he outlines briefly as follows: *concilio, concitando, docendo, exaggeratio, extenuatio, doctrine, explicatio, probatio, amplificatio, dilatio, digressio.*[41] This is followed by an elaborate tabulation of the different kinds of emotions, and this by definitions and explanations of the several types which he lists. He then returns to a consideration of the means of persuasion listed above, developing them in considerable detail.

His analysis of emotions is interesting. Affections are of two general kinds, simple and composite. The simple are those of grief or pleasure; the compound are those of (1) the future; (2) the present and past; (3) the present, past, and future. These are subdivided according to the primary idea of pleasure and grief. Altogether nineteen specific emotions are tabulated and treated, as follows: *voluptas, dolor, desiderium, aversatio, spes, timor, amor, ira, mansuetudo, admiratio, gratia, emulatio, commiseratio, odium, contemptus, invidia, indignatio, verecundia, inverecundia.* His sources are Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero. Butler's is a thoroughgoing analysis of the emotions, reminiscent particularly of

[41] BUTLER, CHARLES, *Oratoriae Duo,* 1929, I, ii, 1.

Aristotle's second book in the *Rhetorica*.[42] This discussion is followed by a short treatment of argument and syllogisms, and by a few remarks on style. The three levels of style, low, grand, and mediocre, and four types, the Asiatic, the Laconic, the Attic, and the Rhodian, are recognized.[43] The parts of the speech, which Butler lists as the exordium, narration, proposition, confirmation, confutation, and peroration, are dealt with at great length. For example, the exordium is treated as follows: (1) its functions, to render the hearers benevolent and attentive, are explained, with citations from all of the sources mentioned above; (2) ten rules are given to be observed in connection with it—that it must not be common, not trite, not separate, but a part of the cause itself, not vulgar, not inane, not long; that it must be accurate, sharp, and well considered; that it must not be insolent in words nor audacious, that it must ordinarily be modest, that the audience, client, opponent, time, place, subject, and judges ought all to be considered, and so on. Equally full are the discussions of the other parts, and equally well fortified with classical precedent and precept. There is an especially good discussion of the use of pathetic appeal in the conclusion.[44] Book I concludes with a good discussion of the nature and status of questions, in Chapters IV and V. Not only the subject of the *status*, but the topics and arguments for the three kinds of orations, demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial, are explained in full.

Book II deals with logical proof in a way so complete and detailed as to leave no doubt in the reader's mind that Butler considered it a vital part of oratory. The heads of argument are analyzed and tabulated in a way like that in which, in Book I, he analyzed the emotions of the audience. The division is the standard one, first separating the artificial and the inartificial proofs, and then subdividing according to the methods of logic the artificial proofs. Twenty specific types of proof are cited, altogether: *causa, effectum integrum, membrum, genus, species, subjectum, adjunctum, diversa, disparata, contraria, paria, majora, minora, definitio, distributio, testimonium, exemplum.* These are discussed in several chapters.[45]

[42] BUTLER, *op. cit.* I, ii, 2.
[43] *Ibid.*, I, ii, 3.
[44] BUTLER, *op. cit.*, I, iii, 1-6.
[45] *Ibid.*, II, ii, 1-6.

Butler then returns to the problem of disposition, viewed after the fashion of Quintilian, as the problem of adapting the entire speech to the specific situation. He treats of the disposition of arguments, of disposition of stylistic devices, of axioms, and of the parts of the speech. Always the concept of adaptation to the audience seems foremost in his mind. In treating of the disposition of style, for instance, he remarks that the style must be congruous to the matter, the persons, and the place. In speaking of the arrangement of the parts of the speech, he points out that the natural order may be modified by the situation. Section 5 of this chapter points out that whatever the arrangement, the speaker must conciliate his hearers by way of preparation for his argument, and arouse them by his conclusion.[46]

After referring his readers to the *Rhetoricae Libri Duo* for further material on style and delivery, he devotes a chapter to memory. Finally in his epilogue, he philosophizes about nature, art, and practice in a way truly classical. Nature, he says, gives ingenuity, memory, voice and other physical and mental characteristics to the orator; art corrects and perfects the things given by nature; and exercise, or practice, brings the speaker to perfection. He closes with the counsel to imitate that which is good, and names certain of Cicero's speeches which he considers models.[47]

Butler, as has been suggested, seems to have gone directly to classical sources for his material. His treatment is more scholarly and more thorough than that of Farnaby. He has caught something of the richness and detail of classical lore, rather than the mere outlines. That his work was influential there is little doubt. It was used in the grammar schools, and enjoyed a good many editions during the century. It deserves to rank with Farnaby, if not for influence, at least for thoroughness of classical treatment; and to rank above Farnaby for its details and for its direct contact with ancient sources.

WILLIAM PEMBLE'S *Enchiridion Oratorium*, 1633. This little book, of 78 pages, treats invention and disposition. It recognizes the traditional aims, kinds, and divisions of rhetoric, however, although Pemble is not certain that memory should be considered one of the canons. His definition of rhetoric is as follows: "*Rhe-*

[46] BUTLER, *op. cit.*, II, iii, 1-5.
[47] *Ibid.*, II, iv, v, *epilogus*.

torica est ars de gravis materia ornate et copiose disserendi ad popularem notitiam et persuasionem."[48] To invention, Pemble gives nine chapters. He explores the possibilities of logical proof and amplification, treats the special types of proof needed for each of the three kinds of orations, discusses the "states" of the cause rather fully, and glances at adaptation to the audience. His treatment, however, is preponderantly logical rather than psychological, that is, he gives relatively little attention to pathetic proof. In the five chapters given to disposition, the exordium, the narration and partition, the confirmation, the refutation, and the conclusion occupy one chapter each, and a chapter is given to a consideration of the special problems of disposition in the three types of speeches. The work as a whole is schematic and over-analyzed. Topics are divided and sub-divided at great length. Pemble has the faults of Farnaby in this respect, without having his inclusiveness or his apparent contact with classical and continental Renaissance sources. It resembles the *Arte or Crafte* of Leonard Cox in scope and to some extent in treatment.

THOMAS HOBBES' *Whole Art of Rhetorick,* 1637. This work reprinted in 1681, contributed definitely toward the classical trend. The first part of it consists of a brief and idiomatic translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric,* the precepts being included but most of the illustrative material left out. In the preface to the edition of 1681, appears the following statements, "Mr. Hobbes chose to recommend by his translation the Rhetoric of Aristotle, as being the most accomplish'd work on that Subject, which the World has yet seen, having been admir'd in all Ages, and in particular highly approv'd by the Father of Roman Eloquence, a very competent judge." The following quotations will give a nation of Hobbes' style in the translation.

> Rhetoric, is that Faculty, by which we understand what will serve our turn, concerning any Subject to win belief from the hearer.[49]
>
> In all Orations, the Hearer does either hear only; or judge also.
>
> If he hear only, that's one kind of Oration, and is called Demonstrative.

[48] PEMBLE, WILLIAM, *Enchiridion Oratorium,* 1633, p. 1.
[49] HOBBES, tr. *Rhetoric,* I, 2.

> If he judge he must judge either of that which is to come, or of that which is past.
>
> If of that which is to come there's another kind of Oration, and is called Deliberative.
>
> If of that which is past, then 'tis a third kind of Oration, called Judicial.
>
> So there are three kinds of Orations: Demonstrative, Judicial, Deliberative.[50]

To Aristotle's treatment, he makes only one addition, and that in respect to delivery, when he interpolates the following paragraph, "In the meantime this may be one general Rule. If the Words, Tone, Greatness of the Voice, Gesture of the Body and Countenance, seem to proceed all from one Passion, then 'tis well pronounced. Otherwise not. For when there appeared more passions than one at once, the mind of the Speaker appears unnatural and distracted. Otherwise, as the mind of the Speaker, so the mind of the Hearer, always."[51]

After his translation of Aristotle, he adds a section which he calls *The Art of Rhetorick,* in which, inconsistently enough, he defines rhetoric as the art of speaking "finely," which has two parts, garnishing of speech, called elocution, and garnishing of the manner of utterance, called pronunciation (cf. Fenner, 1584). In this section, he deals briefly with metonymy, irony, metaphor, synechdoche, and oratorical rhythm, ending with this remark, "And thus much of the garnishing of speech, . . . rather to give some taste of the same to the readers, than to draw any to the curious and unnecessary practise of it."[52] Finally, he gives a brief discussion of some fallacies of equivocation, and of syllogistic reasoning.

Other Works. With the works discussed above, the return to classicism became a definitely-established movement. Michael Radua's *Orator Extemporaneus,* 1657, for instance, is said by Gibert, in his article on Farnaby, to resemble the *Index Rhetoricus.* William Dugard's *Rhetorices Elementa, quaestionibus et responsionibus explicata,* 1640, a book which reached its seventh edition in 1673, and a printing of which (the 16th edition) was made as late as 1741, was a book after the fashion of Vicars' *Manuductio,*

[50] HOBBES, *op. cit.* I, 3.
[51] *Ibid.,* III, 1.
[52] HOBBES, *op. cit.,* p. 147.

and widely used in the grammar schools. Basset Jones' *Hermaeologium, or an Essay on the Rationality of the Art of Speaking,* as a supplement to Lily's grammar, appeared in 1659, and likewise John Prideaux's *Sacred Eloquence; or the Art of Rhetoric as it is laid down in the Scriptures,* and Obadiah Walker's *Some Instructions Concerning the Art of Oratory.* Ralph Johnson published in 1662 his *Scholars guide from the accidence to the university, or, short, plain and easie rules for performing all manner of exercises in the grammar school, etc.,* a book containing a section on rhetoric. Robert Brunus' *Rudimentorum Rhetoricorum, libri quinque, Aberdeen,* 1666, illustrates the persistence of the classical tradition. Book I deals with the materials of rhetoric, its nature and parts, the "states" of causes, etc. Book II deals with invention, treating first argument in general, and then as applied to the types of speeches. Finally the passions, and the matter of adaptation to audiences, is discussed. Book III deals with disposition, giving one chapter to the exordium, and one to the other parts of the speech. Book IV treats style. Purity and dignity are the chief characteristics discussed, and in connection with dignity, tropes and figures are explained. Book V. deals with pronunciation, giving one chapter to the voice and one to the gestures of the body.[55]

SUMMARY

The principal works which supported the classical tradition have now been reviewed. These, in conjunction with the critical suggestions of Bacon and others, the influence of continental, and particularly Jesuit rhetoricians, and the growing interest in the classical works themselves, shown by the many editions printed in England, constitue the evidence to show that the ancient ideas of rhetoric were firmly reestablished by about the middle of the century. This does not mean that the "rhetoric of exornation" immediately vanished. The works of Barton, Smith, Blount and the like carried on that tradition to about 1660. But never again, in the history of English or American theories of public address,

[55] I am indebted to Professor H. J. C. Grierson of Edinburgh University for the information given above. He gave considerable time to the location and reviewing of Brunus. He finds in Brunus' classification of tropes, according to their nature, one of the possible sources of Bain's classification of Figures of similitude, of contiguity, and of contrast.

were style and delivery considered by a majority of writers the principal elements of effective speaking, unless, indeed, the elocutionary movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had that effect.

WILSON AND HIS SOURCES

RUSSELL H. WAGNER
Cornell University

WHEN young Thomas Wilson wrote the first complete *Rhetoric* in English, he was still, after twelve years, a Cambridge student. He may have been studying for the doctorate of laws, which he later obtained, in his Italian exile, at Ferrara. He may have been a fellow; he had certainly been tutoring private students, notably the two sons of the Duchess of Suffolk. At any rate he found himself enjoying in the summer of 1552 a "quiet time of vacation," at Sir Edward Dimmock's home in Lincolnshire. Encouraged by the reception of *The Rule of Reason,* the first work on Logic in English, which he had published the previous year, he determined to set forth in English *The Arte of Rhetorique* "for the use of all such as are studious of Eloquence."

It is possible that the young Cambridge scholar did not intend to write this work when he came to visit his friend, Sir Edward. But life at the home of the King's Champion and Sheriff of Lincolnshire may have palled upon the studious Wilson. Perhaps he found the excuse of writing useful in avoiding that round of activities of a country gentleman for which the exciting intellectual life of the university group of the time had unfitted him. Or perhaps he gladly seized the opportunity to commit to paper the ideas that he had acquired through the long communion with Ascham, Cheke, Smith, Haddon, and Bucer at Cambridge, and through his own study of the classical works on eloquence, which the Renaissance had made so dear to these pioneers of the Newer Humanism.

It is possible that Master Wilson wrote his *Rhetoric* with few of his books available. It is doubtful if Sir Edward's library boasted many of the classical authorities on oratory. The young

author may have brought a slender treatise or two along. He may have relied for his material on that remarkable memory which was to aid him in his later brilliant career, culminating in the position of Secretary of State under Queen Elizabeth. In this case he must have revised the work when he returned to Cambridge and its libraries in the autumn.

Fruitless must be our attempts to decide *a priori,* what works were before Wilson when he began to write. But it is easy to make a list of his authors simply by looking at the names cited in the work itself. And so have the critics and historians of literature done, with an economy of their own time and labor, commendable, perhaps, except for three considerations: first, it is possible that a writer may mention a name of an author and fail to use his work on the subject; second, the writer, especially in the Tudor days of easy virtue as regards originality, may sometimes not mention his sources at all; and third, he may even be mistaken as to his sources, when he relies too much on even a good memory.

There are, then, many discrepancies in the lists of authorities cited for Wilson. Professor Jebb, in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "*The Arte of Rhetorique,* by Thomas Wilson, embodied rules chiefly from Aristotle, with help from Cicero and Quintilian."[1] This is echoed by Monroe in his *Cyclopedia of Education:* "The rules of rhetoric are taken from Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian."[2] C. H. Conley, in his work on *The First English Translators of the Classics*[3] makes Wilson's work *a translation* of Cicero, Aristotle and Quintilian. But Mair, in his Introduction to the 1909 reprint disagrees as to Aristotle, and says of Wilson's work: "His book is a judicious compilation from Quintilian as far as the first two books are concerned, while the third owes almost as much to Cicero."[4] Carpenter, the editor of Cox's *Rhetoric,* doubts his using Cox to any extent and feels that he follows, rather independently, Cox's sources, Quintilian, Cicero, Erasmus, and Melanchthon.[5] D. L. Clark, in *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renais-*

[1] 11th Ed., Article on *Rhetoric.*

[2] Article on Wilson.

[3] 1927, p. 22, note 22 and p. 139.

[4] THOMAS WILSON'S *Arte of Rhetoryke,* reprinted in 1909, with an introduction by G. H. MAIR, pp. XIX, XX.

[5] The *Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke,* 1530 (?), ed. by CARPENTER, 1899, p. 32.

sance, says: "But Wilson wrote a very good rhetoric with no books before him but Quintilian, Cicero and the rhetoric *Ad Herennium,* which he thought to be Cicero's, Erasmus, Plutarch, *De audiendis poetis,* and St. Basil."[6] Professor Rhys Roberts has recently concluded that "Through Cicero and Quintilian, if not directly, Wilson's *Rhetorique* goes back to Aristotle."[7]

The mere listing of names of rhetoricians mentioned by Wilson scarcely permits the positive and categorical affirmation of their importance in the *Rhetoric.* At least one other test must be applied: what does a careful substantive examination of what he says reveal? None of the writers above seem to have made such a test except Clark, who is sometimes in error.

Aristotle is mentioned twice. Once Wilson quotes from the *Nicomachean Ethics* his saying that "The sun is not so wonderful to the world as the just dealing of a governor is marvelous to all men."[8] This, occurring in a declamation on justice given by way of example, is certainly not to be construed as an Aristotelian rhetorical influence. The other is the statement that he who can praise a man can also dispraise him, as Aristotle says of contraries.[9] This seems to come directly from the *Rhetoric:* "No special treatment of censure and vituperation is needed. Knowing the above facts, we know their contraries; and it is out of these that speeches of censure are made."[10]

Are these, then, all the evidences of Aristotle in Wilson? Assuredly they are. An examination of the leading ideas and conceptions of the latter must preclude, on the face of things, any great use of the great Stagirite. Rhetoric for Aristotle was the faculty of observing in any given case the means of persuasion. For Wilson it was the art of discourse. The one, looking at the use of rhetoric, attempted to systematize its theory and principles as he had systematized most of the other existing arts and sciences. The other, looking upon an awakened England, observing the desire to speak and write effectively in the native tongue, attempted to render practical aid by means of useful principles and suggestions

[6] 1922, p. 139.

[7] *Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism,* 1928, p. 148.

[8] Mair's reprint, 1909, p. 25, lines 6-8 (This printing is used throughout.)

[9] P. 17, lines 12-16.

[10] 1368 a 36 ff. Trans. by Rhys Roberts, 1924.

from the best sources. The very arrangement of the book, following as it does the conventional Latin division of invention, disposition, elocution, memory and pronunciation, indicate that for this purpose the Latin works had been found most acceptable. Of Aristotle's distinctive contributions in logical and ethical proof, the careful analyses of groups and types of hearers, and the thorough discussion of the problems and topics of deliberative oratory, we find no echo in Wilson. It is safe to say that there is no instance of Wilson's using Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, excluding the quotation on the method of censure cited above. Every item of Wilson's theory, aside from his own homely advice, can be traced to indubitable sources, and they are all post-Aristotelian.

Two supposed exceptions to this statement may need some explanation. It has been assumed by some that Wilson's famous denunciation of "inkhorn Terms" and advocacy of plainness and aptness in the use of words were resultant on his study of Aristotle.[11] Perhaps because Wilson gives as an example of ink-horn language a letter reputed to have been written by a Lincolnshire man, in which monstrous latinizations of ordinary English words occur, it has been presumed that he had a special antipathy toward latinizations. But the context of the letter will not support this presumption. Wilson objects to any circumlocution or display of linguistic ability, whether it is the clerk who can talk nothing but Chaucer, the Italianated Englishman, or the Gallicizer. It is not Latin in English any more than French or Italian, to which he objects.[12] And it is not necessary to go to Aristotle to find objections to archaisms, hyphenated forms, or foreign words. Cicero, echoed by Quintilian, had said, in language strangely similar: "What kind of elocution can be better . . . than that of speaking in pure Latin, with plainness, with grace, and with an aptness meet for the subject matter."[13] Moreover, on this subject the writers of the Renaissance had developed an attitude depend-

[11] We must understand this to be Rhys Roberts' view in his *Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism*, 1928, pp. 148, 9, and notes 9 and 10, p. 160.

[12] In his *Rule of Reason*, 1551, 1563, fol. 1a line 21 ff. Wilson had, in fact, satirized the improper use of Greek terms in English.

[13] *De Oratore* III. 10 and *Institutio* XI. 1. 10. The correspondence between Wilson's parts of elocution—plainness, aptness, composition, and exornation—with Cicero's divisions is at least suggestive.

ent on no classical theory. Erasmus many times, especially in his *Praise of Folly,* pillories the user of uncouth and strange words of foreign origin, and he is corroborated by Ascham in *Toxophilus.*

The other instance is the brief fable of the scabbed fox, attributed to Themistocles by Wilson. Clark[14] accuses Wilson of misquoting from Aristotle's *Rhetoric,* where the tale is credited to Aesop, not to Themistocles. Wilson is not quoting from Aristotle, however, but takes this as well as other stories at this point from Erasmus, who also makes the author of the fable Themistocles.[15]

There is no reason to conclude that Wilson had not seen Aristotle's *Rhetoric.* It was, probably, among the Greek works he had read under the influence of that Cambridge coterie headed by Ascham, Cheke, and Smith. Ascham had reported to Archbishop Cranmer in 1547: "That for oratory, they plied Plato and Aristotle; from whose fountains among the Greeks, *loquens illa prudentia* (as he styled oratory) *that speaking prudence* might be fetched."[16] But if Wilson read the *Rhetoric* or heard it read, it is clear that the only use he made of it is in the reference to contraries. In the earlier *Logic* he took his theory not not from the *Categories* or the *Sophistici Elenchi,* but from those Latin works which the medieval world had developed and used. So in the *Rhetoric* he went to the best of those Latin sources which were the delight of the Humanists who preceded him and of those who taught practical rhetoric in the time of the Renaissance.

If Wilson owes nothing to the first great name in the art of speaking, he is deeply indebted to the second. In the *Rule of Reason* he had defined rhetoric as the art of ornamentation, in the traditional English manner.[17] But in the *Rhetoric* he defined his

[14] *Op. Cit.* p. 119.

[15] *De Copia Verborum, Opera Omnia,* 1703-6, I 98 E.

[16] STRYPE, *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer,* 1812, Vol. I, p. 240.

[17] Ed. of 1563, fol. 2 b lines 5, 6, and fol. 3 a lines 7-13. The only important exception to this traditional view in the works of those writing in English is that of Cox in *The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke,* 1530 (?). The persistence of the late medieval conception of rhetoric as ornamentation or style, observable in Chaucer, Lydgate, Hawes, Sherry, Peacham and others, is noted by Clark, *op. cit. Chaps.,* V and VI. Clark seems justified in his statement, p .68, that "not until the seventeenth century, as has been shown, did rhetoric in England come again to mean what it had in classical antiquity," although he should make an exception of Wilson and perhaps of Cox.

subject as the art of artistic discourse, and his citation of Cicero as his authority indicates that he had been reviewing the *De Oratore* and *De Inventione* since writing his *Logic*. The three ends of rhetoric, to teach, to delight and to persuade, the methods by which one attains eloquence, the value of a written work on rhetoric to the aspiring orator, are all broad, philosophical conceptions derived from the *De Oratore*. The other uses of that work are of a different type. The long discussion of delighting the hearers is admittedly borrowed from Caesar's disquisition on humour in the second book of the *De Oratore;* and all the figures of thought and of sentences, with many of the examples are also taken therefrom. In addition, a definite utilization of the *Partitiones Oratoriae* and the *Brutus* is found, and recourse to the *De Inventione* and *Orator* is suspected.

Clark seems to have been the first to discover that much of Wilson's debt to Cicero must be transferred to the *De Ratione Dicendi Ad Herennium*.[18] This work was, until the time of Erasmus, and long afterwards, thought to be Cicero's. Its concise style, orderly arrangement, and condensed nature made it the most popular manual of rhetoric in the medieval schools, and the most frequently copied of any of the works attributed to Cicero. From this treatise Wilson takes most of his outline and much of his theory. It supplies six of the seven parts of speech and the discussion of five, the division of cases into honest, filthy, doubtful, and trifling, the nomenclature and exposition of judicial oratory, the general framework and much of the matter of the second book, some of the details of elocution, and most of the treatment of memory and pronunciation. This constitutes a very extensive borrowing; none except Clark have even suspected the influence of the *Ad Herennium* on Wilson, and he has certainly not hinted at its magnitude.

It seems very unlikely that Wilson had a copy of Quintilian with him at Sir Edward Dimmock's house. One is forced to conclude that here again the historians have been misled by the appearance of that famous name in the pages of the *Rhetoric*. The terms "will to do evil" and "power to do evil," are Quintilianesque additions to the section on judicial oratory taken in the large from the *Ad Herennium*. The discussion of proposition, a part of

[18] *Op. cit.*, pp. 63, 64.

demonstrative oratory, the methods of moving to anger, the divisions of figures, and the discussion of tropes, are probably from the *Institutio,* though the parallelisms are much less striking than in the borrowings from others. And these are comparatively unimportant in size and significance. It seems strange that, if he had a thorough knowledge of Quintilian, Wilson did not catch that author's belief in the value of ethical persuasion and his concept of orator-statesman-philosopher. But the books of Quintilian, full of ripe pedagogical, literary and oratorical wisdom as they are, had not been of much influence in the teaching of practical speech in the centuries before Wilson.[19] Whether or not he knew the *Institutio* well, he apparently found his most useful guiding principles in Cicero and his technical details in the concise and orderly *Ad Herennium* rather than in the thought-provoking but more diffuse *Institutio.*

The influence of Erasmus on English rhetoric has thus far scarcely been suspected.[20] An examination of the work of Erasmus shows that he had a great interest in improving expression in general, in raising the standard of pulpit oratory in particular, and in the technical aspects of rhetoric, poetic and literary criticism. He wrote the *De Duplici Copia Rerum et Verborum* as a contribution to the art of amplification; in the *De Conscribendis Epistolis* he incorporated much of his rhetorical theory as an aid to letter writing; and in the *De Ratione Concionandi,* a work on sacred eloquence, he combined the best of classical rhetoric and practical advice on speaking from the pulpit. The first two treatises were used as texts at Eton and Cambridge during Wilson's period of study there. Erasmus was known as the chief Renaissance authority on classical literature, in England as on the Continent. Wilson, the interpreter of rhetoric to the English could not but have been influenced by Erasmus, the interpreter of literature

[19] This is not to overlook the evidence compiled by Colson in his edition of *Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria, Book I,* 1924, pp. lxiv ff. showing the great revival of Quintilian after the finding of the complete text by Poggio in 1416. I have considered mainly the use of Quintilian in the schools and in the works of the practical rhetoricians. Erasmus and Melanchthon are, perhaps, exceptional in their use of the Institutio.

[20] CLARK, *op. cit.* pp. 68, 139 mentions him as one of Wilson's sources but does not suggest that Wilson took from him more than Wilson himself indicates.

and culture (wherein rhetoric had a most distinguished place) to the world.

To Erasmus, Wilson went for leading ideals, for detailed matter, and for examples and critical dicta. The tendency in Wilson to regard deliberative and demonstrative oratory as written, personal discourse, he no doubt acquired, unconsciously perhaps. from the *De Conscribendis Epistolis.* The fact that amplification of ideas becomes an important end in the *Rhetoric,* superseding logical proof, is to be traced to the influence of Erasmus' works. From that source he took bodily, almost, the discussion of delibera tive oratory, amplification proper, and most, if not all, of the special suggestions to preachers.

Wilson must have known the earlier work of Cox. Whether or not he used it is somewhat controversial. Wilson's list of circumstances of a deed, his places in praise of a deed, and the commonplaces in dealing with races are practically identical in substance and language with Cox. They are not to be derived from Cicero, Quintilian or Erasmus, though the first two lists are to be found in Melanchthon, Cox's chief source. There seems no other proof of Wilson's using Melanchthon, however, and until we have better evidence, Cox must be made a minor source.

Clark says that St. Basil and Plutarch were used by Wilson. This opinion rests on this statement in Wilson: "And as Plutarch saith: and likewise *Basilius Magnus:* in the Iliades are described strength of the body; In Odissea is set forth a lively pattern of the mind."[21] But these interpretations are not found in Plutarch's *Tne Right Use of Greek Literature* or St. Basil's *How a Young Man Should Study Poetry,* the most likely sources, or in any other works of either author. On the other hand, these characterizations of the Homeric works, which have been current in every age, can easily be gathered from Erasmus' works.[22] At this point Wilson is drawing heavily on Erasmus; moreover, it is Erasmus' habit to refer to Plutarch and St. Basil as sponsors of much of his critical theory. Perhaps Wilson confused Erasmus' dicta with other current ideas attributed to these Greek authors. At any rate,

[21] P. 195, lines 30-35.

[22] Especially *De Conscribendis Epistolis, Opera Omnia,* 1703-6, I 390 A ff. and *De Copia Verborum, ibid.* I 90 F.

he seems not to have used them for any rhetorical, poetic, or critical theory.[23]

The student who expects to find in Wilson traces of the evolution of rhetorical theory from classical to early modern times will be disappointed. The only distinctive evidence of such development (or degeneration) is the conception of deliberative oratory, as written, personal persuasion. This, derived from Erasmus, is part of that tendency to divert rhetoric into the channel of letter-writing which appeared in the late medieval period.[24] But it is really an exception. Of such rhetoricians as Martianus Capella, Isidore of Seville, Alcuin, and Bede we find nothing. Wilson turned directly to the classics for his authority, with help now and again from such respected Renaissance interpreters of the ancients as Erasmus.

It is proper to ask, not only what authorities Wilson uses but how he uses them. Some writers have maintained that his *Rhetoric* is only a translation of classical works, others have said it is a mere exemplification of classical rules.[25]

One important characteristic of Wilson's method is his eclecticism. He takes his theory from various sources, as it best fits his general conceptions. Thus he relies on Quintilian for demonstrative oratory, on Erasmus for deliberative, and on the *Ad Herennium* for judicial. In developing elocution he is most eclectic, combining ideas drawn from Cicero, Quintilian, the *Ad Herennium*, and Donatus, with some admixture of Erasmus, all well salted with his own critical judgments and opinions. He is mainly careful to select what he needs and not to include meaningless mat-

[23] A similar reliance on Erasmus which has been unsuspected is found in the supposedly original observation of Wilson's that "Among the learned men of the Church none useth this figure [similitudes] more than Chrysostom, whose writings the rather seem more pleasant and sweet." (P. 190, lines 20-22). Yet this is certainly a translation of Erasmus' remark concerning the same figure: "Among the learned men of the church none uses this figure more freely than John Chrysostom." *(De Ratione Concionandi, Opera Omnia,* 1703-6, V. 1011 A.)

[24] PAETOW, *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric.* Univ. of Ill. Studies, III. 7, Jan. 1910, pp. 70. 90. See also LEACH, *The Schools of Medieval England,* 1915, p. 304.

[25] CONLEY, *First English Translators of the Classics, loc. cit.* and article on *Rhetoric* in Monroe's *Cyclopedia of Education.*

ter. Thus he might easily have been tempted to include in his treatment of elocution something on rhythm and modulation, of which Cicero and Quintilian made so much, but, no doubt realizing the futility of adapting this lore to the unpolished public speaking of the day, he makes no mention of them.

Mair has properly called attention to Wilson's habit of drawing on the same writer for consecutive material.[26] This is quite true, and to an extent not suggested by Mair, who confines his observation to the coupling of stories in the section on humor. The two references to Erasmus in the section on deliberative oratory give us small reason to suppose that the eclectic Wilson is indebted only to Erasmus for the whole discussion. Yet such is the case, and this characteristic must be set alongside that of eclecticism.

Certain types of carelessness may be observed. Some categories are announced as if they were to be main headings, but are never referred to again. Such are the definite and indefinite questions, the kinds of causes, and the three styles of oratory.[27] Presumably Wilson found these divisions important in his authorities and thought they would be useful in his book, but found nothing further to say of them. Errors of duplication and omission are also found, as, the repetition of one purpose of rhetoric, "that the ignorant may judge of the learned," in "that the blunt also shall be whetted," [28] and the omission of confirmation from the parts of the demonstrative speech.[29] A number of misquotations from the Bible must be laid to over-reliance on an excellent memory.

Most accusations of carelessness on Wilson's part must be scrutinized. We have seen how Clark's assumption that Wilson misquoted Aristotle's version of the fox and flea fable is unfounded. In the same class is Mair's statement that Wilson garbles the story of Vibius Curius which he supposes to have been taken from Udall, where the name is Iubius Curtius.[30] As a matter of fact Wilson at this point is taking his stories from Quintilian, where the name is Vibius Curius as Wilson writes it.

[26] *Op. cit.* p. XXIV.

[27] P. 1, lines 21-3; p. 7, line 39; p. 8, line 17; p. 169, line 27; p. 170, line 8.

[28] P. 5, lines 20-34.

[29] P. 17, lines 8-11.

[30] *Op. cit.* p. xxiv.

How closely does Wilson follow his originals? Does he adapt or translate? Support for both statements may be found. One of the most striking examples of translation is that from the *Ad Herennium* in his section on memory.[31] Some of the most significant correspondences are:

Wilson:

> Memory is partly natural, and partly artificial. Natural memory, is when without any precepts or lessons, by the only aptness of nature, we bear away such things as we hear.

Ad Herennium:

> Now there are two types of memory, the one artistic, the other natural. The natural is that which is embedded in our mind, born simultaneously with thinking.

Wilson:

> They that will remember many things, and rehearse them together out of hand: must learn to have places, and digest images in them accordingly. A place is called any room, apt to receive things. An image is any picture or shape, to declare some certain thing thereby.

Ad Herennium:

> Now we shall speak of artistic memory. The artistic memory consists of places and images. We call them places which have been briefly, perfectly and definitely completed by nature or the hand of man, so that we can comprehend and embrace them easily in the natural memory: a house, a space between two columns, a corner, a vault and the like. Images are certain forms and marks and likenesses of that which we wish to remember, such as horses, lions, eagles.

Wilson:

> 1. The places of memory are resembled unto wax and paper.
> 2. Images are counted like unto letters or a seal.
> 3. The placing of these images is like unto words written.
> 4. The utterance and using of them, is like unto reading.

Ad Herennium:

> Places are like wax or writing paper, images like letters, the disposition and collocation of images like writing, delivery like reading.

Wilson:

> And now to make this hard matter somewhat plain I will use an example. My friend (whom I took ever to be an honest man' is accused of theft, of adultery, of riot, of manslaughter,

[31] The following passages are found in Wilson pp. 213-215 and *Ad Herennium*, III. 16-21.

> and of treason: if I would keep these words in my remembrance, and rehearse them in order as they were spoken, I must appoint five places, the which I had need to have perfectly in my memory, as could be possible. As for example, I will make these in my chamber. A door, a window, a press, a bedstead, and a chimney. Now in the door, I will set Cacus the thief, or some such notable varlet. In the window I will set Richard the Third, King of England, or some notable murderer. In the chimney I will set the black Smith or some other notable traitor.

Ad Herennium:

> We often comprehend the memory of an entire matter by one simple impression and image; for example, as when an accuser will say that the man was killed by the defendant through poisoning and will charge that it was done for the sake of the inheritance and will say there are many witnesses and confidants to the matter . . . in the first place we shall form an image of the whole matter: we shall make the victim himself, the manner of whose death is in question, a sickman lying on his couch, and we shall bring the defendant to his couch, in his right hand the cup, in the left the will-tablets, holding a ram's stones for the doctor.

Even here, especially in the last instance, we see Wilson's instinct for adaptation at work. Elsewhere, it is even more true that he tries to suit the ideas of his sources to the problems and needs of 16th Century England. A very interesting example of this instinct for adaptation in the large is his use of Erasmus' *De Ratione Concionandi*, a work on preaching, which Wilson uses in his lengthy discussion of amplification and appeal to the emotions. Not once does Wilson fail to broaden this work so that its principles are suitable to all types of speeches; when he occasionally refers to the problems of preachers he always makes it plain that these are special applications. We should also observe that Wilson does not hesitate to disagree with his sources when he feels he has a good reason. For example, he notes Erasmus' depreciation of artistic memory, and answers him with arguments of Cicero's and his own.

In the task of making a rhetoric for the English from the materials of the past, Wilson's unifying and directing guide was his fixed purpose of aiding those studious of eloquence who had not the ability or opportunity to go to classic sources. By wise selection, by condensation, and by keeping firmly to his purpose, he

made his sources his own and succeeded fairly well in constructing a unified textbook, if not truly original. By exposition in familiar terms, by frequent illustration, and by the insertion of much practical advice based on his own observation, he gave to his English rhetoric an English flavor.

ROBERT SOUTH

NORMAN MATTIS
Oberlin College

THE fame of Robert South is secure; his sermons long ago won for him a foremost position among the preachers of the English Church. The most unfriendly critics, caustic in their judgment of South as a man, and strongly averse to certain characteristics of his work, concede his pre-eminence as a rhetorician. His sermons, considered solely as specimens of rhetorical discourse, amply repay study, for they include nearly all the excellencies of that type of composition. South gains special interest however, from the fact that he has given explicit expression, in various places, to those rhetorical theories which governed the construction of his sermons. He was not only an effective writer of persuasive speeches, but the conscious critic of oratory and of oratorical style.

I

South lived through a period of unsurpassed significance in English history. Born in 1634, he witnessed all the manifold changes in every aspect of English life which are associated with the Great Rebellion, the Protectorate, the Restoration, the Settlement of '89, and the Hanoverian Succession. He was a schoolboy at Westminster when the rebels executed Charles I; he was a young man at the university when Cromwell died; and he outlived Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Anne. When Anne died, and George became king, South told a friend that "it was time for him to prepare for his journey to a blessed immortality; since all that was good and gracious, and the very breath of his nostrils had made its departure to the regions of bliss and eter-

nal happiness.'"[1] He proved a prophet, and survived Anne, the last English sovereign of that House of Stuart to which he had devoted his best talents, by less than two years, dying July 8, 1716, at the age of eighty-two.[2]

Considering the incessant disturbances of his era, South's career was remarkably free from vicissitudes of fortune. He entered Westminster school when he was thirteen years old, and there, in an institution which trained "her sons and scholars to an invincible loyalty to their prince, and a strict, impartial conformity to the church," he no doubt received, or at least had fortified, those religious and political doctrines which are the most conspicuous elements of his intellectual equipment. An apocryphal tradition relates that Busby, Westminster's famous headmaster, who called his rod his *sieve*, and declared that all of his boys must pass through it, detected the potential genius in South, and reacted to it in this way: "I see (said he) great talents in that sulky boy, and I shall endeavour to bring them out."[3] Busby's preceptorial severity may or may not have been responsible, but certain it is that South laid a firm foundation at Westminster for his sound and diversified learning of later years. Although John Dryden and John Locke were contemporary Westminsters, we have

[1] *Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions*, by ROBERT SOUTH, D. D. 7 vols., Oxford, 1823, I, Memoir, lxxv. In future references this edition will be listed simply as *Works*. There are a number of other editions, both American and English, and numerous selections from the sermons have been published.

[2] The chief authorities for any life of South are the *Memoirs* prefixed to early editions of the sermons, especially the one published first by Edmund Curll in 1717 and reprinted in many later editions; Anthony Wood's *Athenae Oxoniensis*, ed. Bliss, IV, 631ff; *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, described by himself*, ed. Clark, Oxford, 1891, *passim* (see index); Foster's *Alumni Oxoniensis*, London, 1892, IV, 1391; and South's own sermons. There are occasional references of importance in many other contemporary or near-contemporary works.

[3] *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. Geo. Kirkbeck Hill, II, 304. There is no good evidence that South entertained any animosity toward Busby, although Dean Stanley of Westminster thinks *(Memorials of Westminster Abbey)* that some passages in the sermon on virtuous education (III, 379ff) reflect on Busby's methods of discipline. But Busby appointed South one of his executors *(A brief historical relation of State affairs from Sept., 1678 to Ap. 1714*, by Narcissus Luttrell, Oxford, 1857, III, 460), and the two lie side by side (at South's request) in Westminster Abbey.

no evidence of friendship among the three—nor, if their characters were as opposed in boyhood as their works reveal them to have been in maturity, should we expect them to have been congenial.

South matriculated at Christ Church in 1651, took his B. A. February 24, 1654-55, proceeded M. A. June 12, 1657, and was ordained privately according to Episcopal rites by one of the deprived bishops in 1658. He apparently lived without friction and even with some prospects of advancement during the '50s under successive regimes of Independents and Presbyterians; his career then has given rise to the suspicion that he was a time-server who never allowed principles to interfere with his temporal success. The charge can be neither affirmed nor denied positively; the evidence seems to indicate a firm adherence to principle, with a rational modification of action in the face of unchangeable circumstances.[4] With the Restoration South speedily attained prominence as an extreme Royalist and an orator of conspicuous ability. He was elected public orator of the University August 10, 1660, and won Clarendon's favor by discharging competently the duties of the orator's office when Clarendon was installed chancellor of Oxford. Through that great man's influence, the university soon granted him the degrees of B. D. and D. D., and before the end of Charles II's reign he was a prebendary of St. Peter's, Westminster, Canon of Christ Church, rector of several parishes, and

[4] "What," asked South, "Are most of the histories of the world, but lies? lies immortalized, and consigned over as a perpetual abuse and flam upon posterity?" (I, 316) And again, he remarked that if history were stripped of its partiality, the volume would shrink to the index. (V, 244). Anyone interested in South's life is apt to approve this low opinion of history; the contemporary accounts of the great preacher are a tangle of contradictory statements. The bitter partisanship of the age, and South's uncompromising espousal of the Royalist-Anglican cause account for much mis-statement; and South's temper, often jocosely sarcastic, wounded many contemporaries, so that their references to the orator are tinged with spleen. Needless to say, this paper does not purport to be a thoroughgoing historical study of general significance; I have not, therefore, attempted to achieve a consistent and life-like portrait of South, but have merely mentioned those characteristics which seem indisputable and of most immediate importance to a study of his sermons. A painstaking research into South's career and an impartial evaluation of his character by a competent historian would be of great value if only to supply a lie upon which we could all agree.

had been, at various times, chaplain to Clarendon, to the Duke of York (after Clarendon's exile), and to Charles. Both William and Anne are believed to have offered him a bishopric; he declined the first because he did not wish to supplant one of the "non-juring" Jacobite bishops, with whom he sympathized, and refused the second on account of his great age. In 1676 he departed for almost the only time in his life from the church and university circles to which he was devoted, and went as chaplain to Lawrence Hyde on an embassy to John Sobieski, King of Poland. Our Doctor lost some of his dignity at least once in that foreign land when, after six hours of feasting at a wedding, a dance began and, as he naïvely puts it: "... even I myself, who have no manner of relish for such unedifying vagaries, had a Madonna put into my hand by the bishop of Plosko...."[5]

South, a legitimist to the core, refused to have any share in bringing William of Orange to England in 1689, but after the expulsion of James was an accomplished fact, he took the oaths of allegiance to the new sovereigns. In 1693 he engaged in a furious controversy with Dr. Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's, after the Trinity. The disputants fought so acrimoniously that many came to believe, in the words of a popular ballad of the day, that

> ... Being in a fright, sir,
> Religion took her flight, sir,
> And ne'er was heard of since,
> And ne'er was heard of since.

The king at length intervened to prevent a scandal to religion, and ordered clergymen to abstain from preaching or publishing anything about the Trinity not sanctioned, both in content and form of expression, by the accepted doctrine of the Church of England.[6] South retired into comparative obscurity a few years after his duel

[5] *Works*, Memoir, I, lxv. South describes the trip in a long letter to his friend, the Oxford Orientalist, Thomas Pococke. Additional information, with some valuable side-lights on South's character, can be found in *Clarendon and Rochester, Correspondence*, ed. Samuel Weller Singer. London, 1828.

[6] The titles of South's works in this controversy can be found in the previously-quoted *Memoir* (lxxx ff.) or in the article on South in the D. N. B. A fairly good account of the quarrel, with the king's proclamation stopping it, is in White Kennet's *A Complete History of England*, etc., 3 vols., London, 1719, III, 707.

with Sherlock, and his later years, during most of which he suffered from ill-health, were uneventful. His mind, however, remained unimpaired, and occasionally he roused himself to an active participation in public affairs; he exerted himself, for example, in defense of Dr. Sacheverill. The *Tatler* for August 30, 1709, contains an anecdote which, amusing enough to bear repetition for itself, is valuable for its picture of South in old age. In an earlier number of the *Tatler* one Stentor had been reproved for bellowing too loudly in the responses and for drowning out the chair with his own untuneable pipe, at St. Paul's Cathedral. He did not heed the reproof, and we find Bickerstaff writing, that Stentor

> . . . goes on in his vociferations at St. Paul's with so much obstinacy, that he has received admonition from St. Peter's for it, from a person of eminent wit and piety; but who is by old age reduced to the infirmity of sleeping at a service, to which he has been fifty years attentive; and whose death, whenever it happens, may, with that of the saints, well be called 'falling asleep': for the innocence of his life makes him expect it as indifferently as he does his ordinary rest. This gives him a cheerfulness of spirit to rally his own weakness, and hath made him write to Stentor to hearken to my admonitions. 'Brother Stentor,' said he, 'for the repose of the church, hearken to Bickerstaff; and consider that while you are so devout at St. Paul's, we cannot sleep for you at St. Peter's.'

Dr. South was the man who thus attempted to insure a quiet nap in church.

Although he lived for more than a quarter of a century after the expulsion of James, South is first and foremost a representative of the Restoration. The thirty years between '60 and '90 were the years of his prime and of his greatest productivity, and he is always considered one of that numerous group of illustrious divines who made the Caroline Church memorable in English religious history. Memorable it was; in 1660 Chillingworth, Hales, and Jeremy Taylor were flourishing; "Sanderson was still alive, and Hammond only recently dead; Pearson was at the height of his reputation; South and Bull, and Beveridge and Barrow were already conspicuous; while, not to speak of Baxter and Howe, who had not yet left her pale, a new school had arisen, of whom Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Burnet were the chief active

representatives. . . .'"[7] Ignorant and slovenly many of the Caroline Divines may have been, amply deserving the contempt in which Eachard says that they were held; but whatever the condition of the mass of the ministers, there was room in the episcopal palaces, the cathedral stalls, and the pulpits of the universities and of London for men of the first rank, and never before or since have so many able defenders of "the rights and constitutions of our excellently reformed church," arisen.

II

During the three decades of his greatest activity, South was incomparably the most effective clerical spokesman of the Cavaliers. What that role implied can be understood only by reference to the peculiar political and religious interrelations of the times. The crown and the mitre had fallen together, and they were restored together; the ties between the two had been cemented by the blood of a king who had died defending the established religion. After the Restoration Episcopalians saw in the intimate association of the Church and the State the only bulwark of their monopoly, and gradually theories of the royal authority remarkable to English ears were heard from Anglican pulpits. Kings ruled by divine right, and to resist a royal command under any circumstances was sinful, proclaimed the paladins of the Establishment. ". . . It was inculcated," writes Ranke, "as a peculiarly characteristic command of the English Church, that men should be obedient to authority for God's sake, and that unconditionally, without reserve or exception."[8] "Men . . . vowed that if Nero were hereditary King of England, they would let him take their lands, their tithes, their laws, their very lives, without raising a hand against him. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Anglican Clergy throughout the land, regularly proclaimed these astonishing doctrines."[9] This doctrine of divine right and passive obedience was a religious doctrine, to be inculcated actively as a prime article of Christian belief. ". . . When some very gravely tell us," observes South, "that the sole or chief business of a preacher is to preach up a good life, and to preach down sin, I

[7] W. C. LAKE, "South the Rhetorician" in *Classic Preachers of the English Church*, ed. J. E. Kempe, N. Y. 1877, p. 55.

[8] *History of England*, 6 vols., Oxford, 1875, IV, 182.

[9] TREVELYAN, *England under the Stuarts*, London, 1925, p. 418.

heartily assent to them, but withal must tell them, that I take obedience to government to be a principal part of a good life, and faction and rebellion to be some of the worst, the blackest, and most damning sins that men can be guilty of....[10] "For be a king never so savage, bloody, or unjust, he is, under all these respects, to be looked upon as a plague or a punishment sent by God upon the people, whose duty I am sure is to submit, be the punishment what it will."[11] South therefore mingled religion and politics inextricably; for him, the civil and sacerdotal powers supplemented each other to the better support of the social structure.[12]

This fanatical attachment to the monarchy led directly to that hatred of religious non-conformity which marks the history of the period. The Royalists, remembering the association of Presbyterianism and Independency with the policies which had led to the death of their king, the confiscation of their estates, and the proscription of their religion, regarded a Dissenter as scarcely one remove from a rebel, and demanded and applauded the Acts of Uniformity, the Conventicle Act, the Five Mile Act, and all the other oppressive measures adopted by the Cavalier Parliament. "We have seen men preached into schism, lectured into sacrilege, and prayed into rebellion; the very pulpit has been made to undermine the church,"[13] said South, and if a vigorous exercise of the secular power could restrain the discontented ones, he did not propose to let them flourish," ... there being no casuist comparable to the minister of justice, to answer the sturdy scruples of an en-

[10] *Works*, IV, 237.

[11] *Works*, VII, 214.

[12] These convictions placed South and his colleagues in a most embarrassing position when James II came to the throne, and it became evident that he contemplated nothing less than the re-conversion of England to Roman Catholicism. The Anglicans were placed in the intolerable position of preaching unqualified obedience to a monarch bent on their own destruction! How individuals solved that problem is part of English history; South as we have said, refused to have any part in bringing William from Holland, but after the expulsion of James was an accomplished fact, took the oaths of allegiance (though, says Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, 2 vols. London, 1734, II, 213, "with the reserve of an equivocal sense.")

[13] *Works*, V, 64.

thusiast disposed to rebel.'"[14] Toleration of sects would, he felt, lead to the gravest disorders, because most of the Dissenters pleaded the *conscience* as the sole arbiter of conduct, and the most anti-social actions could be justified on the ground that one's individual conscience authorized them.

Several factors other than this fear of the political dynamite in dissenting principles contribute to South's disgust. Most important, perhaps, was the dislike which South, an orderly, fastidious man, keenly sensitive to the ludicrous, conceived for the slipshod ceremony, or lack of ceremony, found in conventicles and fanatic chapels. South adhered to the Calvinian theology despite the trend of his fellow-churchmen, especially the bishops, toward Arminianism;[15] but he was devoted to the polity of the Church of England, with its careful ordering of worship by episcopal authority, and could see only the ridiculous fads of "enthusiasm." The peculiar notions of cranks would be tried in his church if its discipline were relaxed for the benefit of "tender consciences," and he could not fail to denounce any scheme for a comprehension which would leave matters of form "to the arbitrement of every man's various fancy," so that people might behold the spectacle of "one man paying his reverence to an infinite majesty sitting, another expressing the same reverence (forsooth) with his hat on his head....'"[16] South's loyalty to the Church made him almost equally susceptible to dangers threatening from the Roman Catholics and from such stray heretics as the Socinians; but the immediacy and pervasiveness of the Protestant "fanatic" doctrines, and their connection with the great rebellion, made it inevitable that they should bear the brunt of his wrath.

Temperamentally, South was eminently qualified to be the champion of an aggressive policy. He took on all questions the attitude of a truculent debater. He could not compromise or

[14] *Works*, IV, 78.

[15] HALLAM *(Literary History of Europe*, 4th ed. Boston, 1854, III, 275, 297) says that South inclines toward Arminianism. Whence he derives this notion I am unable to say. Shedd is much nearer the mark when he writes (Article "South" in Schaff-Hertzog *Religious Encyclopaedia):* "Though Anti-Puritan, and bitterly so, in regard to polity, both civil and ecclesiastical, he was a Puritan in Theology. John Owen was not a higher predestinarian than he, and Richard Baxter was a lower one."

[16] *Works*, IV, 87.

moderate his views; to him every concession seemed a confession of weakness. In an age of intemperate controversy and irreconcilable enmities, South achieved fame even among his contemporaries for his certainty of conclusion and unyielding championship of convictions; for "the true *agonistic style and intolerant spirit.*"[17] He could not imagine that the Trimmer or Latitudinarian bishops like Tillotson and Burnet might be intellectually honest. He can pay a fine tribute to *moderation* in the abstract; but as soon as an opponent of one of his favorite doctrines talks of moderation, it forthwith becomes merely a "word to gull and manage the rabble, and to carry on a design by...."[18] This basic trait of character, implacable determination in the maintenance of a few political and religious maxims, determines in large measure the prevailing tone of his sermons.

III

South is, then, distinctly a party preacher; his partisan bias may be detected in almost every sermon that he wrote, and must be kept in mind constantly when one is reading his productions. It would be false, however, to brand him as nothing more than a political parson. Among other things, he preached a gospel of sound public and private morality, based on the proposition that it is sensible and rational to live a good life.[19] His casuistical sermons, on such subjects as lying, ingratitude, and covetousness, display a shrewd insight into the motives of human conduct. Sin and sinners become revoltingly real when he pictures them. The

[17] BIRCH'S *Life of Tillotson*, p. 428.

[18] *Works*, IV, 224-225.

[19] Essentially a rational person, South believed in the rational basis of good morals, and had confidence in the identity of revealed truth and truth attained by ratiocination. He recognized explicitly and even thankfully the limitations of the human intellect, and the incomprehensible mysteriousness of many prime articles of the Christian faith, but he insisted that as reason obliges us to acknowledge the inspiration of scripture, the things therein revealed must not be unreasonable in reality, but only appear to be so. In this reliance on reason as a guide to right conduct and the true religion South anticipates the eighteenth century, as Edward Dowden points out (*Puritan and Anglican Studies in Literature*, New York, 1901, pp. 325ff). South's intolerant spirit has no affinity with the temporising bishops who dominated the Establishment after 1689, but he does share the eighteenth century conviction that a religion must convince the understanding if it is to hold the fealty of the intelligent.

special evils of the day—and there were many—are fiercely denounced and sadly lamented. South could even, like Bossuet, rebuke to his face the king whom he adored, when the occasion offered.[20] He explained capably and defended cogently not only the distinctively Episcopalian, but the Catholic Christian doctrines. He was, in short, a doughty opponent of the theoretical skepticism and practical immorality which he saw everywhere about him.

IV

Nearly all of South's more than a hundred discourses display a logical acumen and philosophical insight worthy of the man whose exalted conception of the ministerial function, expressed in the sermon *The Scribe Instructed,* led him to insist "that the greatest advantages, both as to largeness of natural, and exquisiteness of acquired abilities, are not only consistent with, but required to, the due performance of the work and business of a preacher of the gospel."[21] South's "understanding was large, strong, and acute, grappling every subject he essayed to treat with a stern grasp, and tearing and ripping up, with a peculiar intellectual fierceness, systems and principles which contradicted his own."[22] This native strength of intellect was supplemented by a stock of diversified learning worthy that most learned of ages, the seventeenth century. The indifference of the Puritans to academic discipline irritated him almost more than any other of their weaknesses; through their pernicious influence the most ignorant cobblers, scavengers, butchers, and the like ventured into the ministry, and instead of submitting to the usual rigorous training, took a short cut,

> ...and having read perhaps a treatise or two *upon the Heart, the bruised Reed, the Crumbs of Comfort, Wollebius* in English, and some other little authors, the usual furniture of old women's closets, they have set forth as accomplished divines...."[23]

"I confess," he says, "God has no need of any man's parts or learning; but certainly then, he has much less need of his ignor-

[20] See a notable example in Sermon L, *Pretence of Conscience no Excuse for Rebellion,* III, 448.

[21] *Works,* III, 10, 11.

[22] E. P. WHIPPLE, *Essays and Reviews,* Boston, 1873, I, 383.

[23] *Works,* I, 110.

ance and ill behaviour."[24] South's erudition is implicit in all his work; it does not parade "with difficult nothings, rabbinical whimsies, and remote allusions, which no man of sense and solid reason can hear without weariness and contempt."[25] He has only contempt for the ostentatious display of pedantry which cumbers so much of the sermon-literature of his period, and which so depraved popular taste that in time, as he tells us,

> ... the grossest, the most ignorant, illiterate country people, were of all men the fondest of high-flown metaphors and allegories, attended and set off with scraps of Latin and Greek, though not able to read so much of the latter as might save their necks upon occasion.[26]

Occasionally South indulges a taste for scholastic metaphysics and produces passages which certainly seem to have been intended primarily to astonish the audience with his intellectual ingenuity; but his vigilant common sense usually keeps him well within reach of his hearers' comprehension.

V

Definite notions of the nature of preaching, and a close acquaintance with rhetorical theory enabled South to bring his close-reasoning mind and multifarious information to bear on the preparation of sermons in the most efficient manner. He thought of himself as a *public speaker*. Preaching is oratory upon a sacred subject;[27] its object is persuasion;[28] and to achieve his object the preacher must regulate his oratory by reference to his hearers, and

> ... not dwell only upon the letter and shell of things, but often enlarge and amplify upon the subject he handles, adapting his discourse to the various circumstances, tempers, and apprehensions of his hearers; and so letting it rise or fall in the degrees of its plainness or docility.[29]

Three great faculties, or powers, of the mind co-operate, according to South, in the production of a sermon. The three are judgment, memory, and invention. Judgment corresponds to the ancients' *inventio*, and South's *invention* is equivalent to *elocutio*. All are necessary: judgment untangles the knotty problems

[24] *Works*, I, 108.
[25] *Works*, III, 10, 11.
[26] *Works*, IV, 150.
[27] *Works*, III, 14.
[28] *Works*, III, 24-29.
[29] *Works*, III, 10.

confronting a divine, and supplies the proper arguments; memory is essential because people don't like to listen to sermons which are read to them (and South detested all extempore effusions); and invention, the ability "which suggests apposite and pertinent expressions, and handsome ways of clothing and setting off the truths which the judgment has rationally pitched upon," will be "slighted and disapproved of by none but such as envy that in others, which they are never like to be envied for the want of in themselves."[30]

South was thoroughly familiar with the psychological aspect of persuasion; thus he urges ministers to appeal to the impelling motives of their immediate auditors to secure results, and says that such appeals can be grounded upon nothing but "natural philosophy, and a knowledge of men's passions and interests, the great and chief springs of all their actions."[31] So also, if he would make an effective appeal to men, the preacher ought not to depend on "the toothless generalities of a commonplace," nor "insist only upon universals [which] is but a cold, faint, languid way of persuading or dissuading.... For we know, that men naturally have only a weak, confused knowledge of universals, but a clear and lively idea of particulars."[32]

Our scholarly divine had read the works of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Longinus, and quotes approvingly from them. He has, indeed, absorbed a certain Aristotelian contempt for the art of which he has mastered both the theory and the practice. Preaching is "the least part of a divine";[33] and rhetorical artifices are useful only because men "for the generality, are, one part reason, and nine parts affection. So that one of a voluble tongue, and a dexterous insinuation, may do what he will with vulgar minds, and with wise men too, at their weak times."[34] "Most of the writings and discourses in the world are but illustration and rhetoric, which signifies as much as nothing to a mind eager in pursuit after the causes and philosophical truth of things,"[35] he observes, and

[30] *Works*, III, 12ff.
[31] *Works*, III, 28.
[32] *Works*, III, 26-29.
[33] *Works*, III, 17.
[34] *Works*, I, 407.
[35] *Works*, I, 438.

declares hyperbolically "that he who obtains what he has been rhetorically or importunately begging for, goes away really a conqueror, and triumphantly carrying off the spoils of his neighbour's understanding, or his will. . . ."[36] He distrusted words, and in a series of sermons elaborated a theory that all evil is a result of names being falsely applied: *the calling evil good*.[37] He laments the popularity of sermons—a not uncommon complaint in this century—and regrets the neglect of honest catechising. In some very fine passages of his second sermon on prayer South shows that the highest excellency of speech is brevity *with* clarity; it is amusing to note how he, like most anti-rhetoricians (which he is for the moment) amplifies, restates, and illustrates in order to prove that the utmost brevity is the highest quality of speech.[38]

South perceived, we see, that human defects alone make possible an art of rhetoric; but because those defects are real, he wanted preachers to utilize the art. He had no sympathy for those who objected to its use as "a blending of men's wisdom with the word, an offering of strange fire."[39]

Among the chief characteristics of South's sermons are clear analysis, admirable arrangement, excellent oratorical style, keen wit, and mordant sarcasm. We shall glance for a moment at each of these qualities.

Fundamentally an intellectual, reasoning person, South's sermons reflect his character. He depends chiefly on rational argument for the establishment of conviction. The logical development of a proposition is usually (there are exceptions) the formative influence of the whole discourse. Departures from and additions to the logical framework are most often inspired, to a degree extraordinary in sermons, by political motives.[40] Copious and compre-

[36] *Works*, I, 444.

[37] *Works*, II, 108; IV, 203, 235, 265.

[38] *Works*, I, 435-446.

[39] *Works*, III, 21.

[40] The quality of the reasoning sometimes suffers from the desire to bolster a religious or political prejudice; but in most such instances one feels that if South follows a fallacious line of reasoning, or substitutes declamation for logic, or (what happens more often), deserts his ostensible object in order to bag a fanatic, that he does so with open eyes: that his integrity as a minister, not his capacity as a thinker, is the quality to be impugned.

hensive argumentation, acute analysis, great variety in presentation, and an almost excessive formality characterize the structure of these sermons. There is never any vagueness or perplexity in the main lines (and seldom anywhere); the preacher knows what he means to do and sets about the accomplishment of his purpose in a business-like way, advancing, it has been said, with a "sort of bull-dog fierceness to his purposed end."[41]

The formality which marks the structure of these speeches is largely responsible for the ease with which the argument is comprehended. There are always definite propositions, and very frequently there are explicit partitions of the whole. In addition to these, there are repeated divisions and subdivisions of the arguments; each section is usually numbered and then taken up in order, the number being repeated. This type of sermon-structure, which South preserves even when it involves him in awkward repetitions of juxtaposed numbers, is vulnerable to criticism; in Fenelon's words, "...divisions give only a seeming order; while they really mangle and clog a discourse, by separating it into two or three parts, which must interrupt the orator's action, and the effect it ought to produce."[42] South invalidates many of the notions urged against such heads by the manner in which he employs them. For one thing, they represent logical and integral units of the argument. This prevents them from mounting to the enormous numbers which many preachers of the seventeenth century affected, and which South himself condemns.[43] The phrasing of the announcements is also calculated to produce the minimum of interference with the movement; they are brief, concise, vigorously worded. More, the character of the speeches ought to be taken into account before judgment is passed; what might conceivably destroy the effect of a certain type of luxuriant eloquence may be a positive good in the closely-reasoned, swift-glancing sermons of

[41] JAMES W. ALEXANDER, *Thoughts on Preaching*, New York, 1861, p. 338.

[42] *Dialogues Concerning Eloquence*, Second Dialogue.

[43] *Works*, III, 35. There is also a story about South's attending a dissenting chapel incognito one day, where he listened to the pastor begin the sermon by splitting his text into twenty-six divisions; whereupon South "rose up, and jogging a friend who bore him company, said, 'Let us go home and fetch our gowns and slippers, for I find this man will make night work of it.'" (Memoir, lxxvi).

South, where clarity and easy comprehension of argument are the prime necessities, and the desired impression is more that of a succession of hard hammer-like blows than that of a sonorous organ-roll.

A strongly individual style of rare merit has won for South a place in literature quite independent of his rank as a theologian. He has discussed style in several passages, all of which exhibit sound literary taste. Scripture contains the noblest specimens of human eloquence, he says: and Christ was "furnished with a strain of heavenly oratory far above the heights of all human rhetoric whatever: his sermons being of that grace and ornament, that (as the world generally goes) they might have prevailed even without truth, and yet pregnant with such irresistible truth, that the ornament might have been spared...."[44] "...In God's word we have not only a body of religion, but also a system of the best rhetoric: and as the highest things require the highest expressions, so we shall find nothing in scripture so sublime in itself, but it is reached, and sometimes overtopped by the sublimity of the expression."[45] Note this admirable appreciation:

> And then for the passions of the soul; which being things of the highest transport and most wonderful and various operation in human nature, are therefore the proper object and business of rhetoric: let us take a view how the scripture expresses the most noted and powerful of them. And here, what poetry ever paralleled Solomon in his description of love, as to all the ways, effects, and ecstasies, and little tyrannies of that commanding passion? See Ovid with his *Omnia vincit amor*, etc. and Virgil with his *Vulnus alit venis* et caeco carpitur igne, etc. How jejune and thin are they to the poetry of Solomon, in the 8th chapter of Canticles, and the 6th verse, *Love is strong as death, and jealousy cruel as the grave.* And as for his description of beauty, he describes that so, that he even transcribes it into his expressions. And where do we read such strange risings and fallings, now the faintings and languishings, now the terrors and astonishments of despair venting themselves in such high, amazing strains, as in the 77th Psalm? Or where did we ever find sorrow flowing forth in such a natural prevailing pathos, as in the Lamentations of Jeremy? One would think, that every letter was wrote with a tear, every word was the noise of a breaking heart; that the author was a man compacted of sorrows; disciplined to grief from

[44] *Works*, III, 2-3.
[45] *Works*, III, 21.

> his infancy; one who never breathed but in sighs, nor spoke but in a groan. So that he who said he would not read the scripture for fear of spoiling his style, shewed himself as much a blockhead as an atheist, and to have as small a gust of the elegancies of expression, as of the sacredness of the matter.[46]

South has described, in a sermon on Luke 15, *For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist,* the properties which he believed should characterize excellence of speech. They are:

1. Great clearness and perspicuity.
2. An unaffected plainness and simplicity. And,
3. A suitable and becoming zeal or fervour.[47]

In speaking of the first and fundamental requirement, he says that "nothing in nature can be imagined more absurd, irrational, and contrary to the very design and end of speaking, than an obscure discourse," and he attributes obscurity of speech to confusion and disorder of the speaker's thoughts:

> . . . For as thoughts are properly the images and representations of objects to the mind, and words the representations of our thoughts to others, it must needs follow, that all faults or defects in a man's expressions must presuppose the same in his notions first.[48]

Clarity of thought, then, is the first essential of a good style.

Concerning the second quality of ability of speech, simplicity, South says, with immediate reference to the apostolic rhetoric received miraculously from God, that

> . . . It was to be easy, obvious, and familiar; with nothing in it strained or far-fetched; no affected scheme, or airy fancies, above the reach or relish of an ordinary apprehension. . . . *I speak the words of soberness,* said St. Paul, Acts xxvi. 25; and I preach the gospel not with the *enticing words of man's wisdom,* 1 Cor. ii.4. This was the way of the apostles' discoursing of things sacred. Nothing here *of* the fringes of the north star; nothing of *nature's becoming unnatural;* . . . No starched similitudes introduced with a "Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion," and the like. . . . For the apostles, poor mortals, were content to take lower steps, and to tell the world in plain terms, *that he who believed should be saved, and that he who believed not should be damned.* And this was the dialect which pierced the conscience,

[46] *Works,* III, 22-23.
[47] *Works,* IV, 149.
[48] *Works,* IV, 150-151.

> and made the hearers cry out, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* It tickled not the ear, but sunk into the heart; and when men came from such sermons, they never commended the preacher for his taking voice or gesture; for the fineness of such a simile, or the quaintness of such a sentence; but they spoke like men conquered with the overpowering force and evidence of the most concerning truths. . . .[49]

"In a word, the apostles' preaching was therefore mighty and successful, because plain, natural, and familiar, and by no means above the capacity of their hearers: nothing being more preposterous, than for those who were professedly aiming at men's hearts, to miss the mark, by shooting over their heads."

The third quality, zeal or fervour, is necessary because "A cold indifference dispirits a discourse; but a due fervour gives it life and authority, and sends it home . . . with an easy insinuation and a deep impression." This zeal consists in the preacher's

> . . . shewing a warm and sensible apprehension on his part of the things uttered by him; so that the very manner of his speaking shall demonstrate the real inward sense he has of what he speaks, and that in the judgment of all who hear him.

South illustrates the point with his usual felicity.

> Thus when Christ accosted Jerusalem with that melting exprobation in Matt. xxiii. 37, 38, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.* Now what a relenting strain of tenderness was there in this reproof from the great doctor as well as saviour of souls, and how infinitely more moving than if he had said only, *O ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, how wicked and barbarous is it in you thus to persecute and stone God's prophets! And how can you but expect some severe judgment from God upon you for it?* Who, I say, sees not the vast difference in these two ways of address, as to the vigour and winning compassion of the one, and the low dispirited flatness of the other in comparison?[50]

South's sermons are written to harmonize with these theories of the nature of eloquent discourse. Lucidity, simplicity, often passionate feeling characterise them. His prose is nervous, trenchant, incisive. He handles language with the assurance and firmness of a

[49] *Works*, IV, 151-153. It is commonly supposed that South is deriding Jeremy Taylor in this passage.

[50] *Works*, IV, 154-155.

man who has mastered his instrument and knows what can be done with it. In richness of vocabulary, and closeness of connection between thought and word, South can be matched by very few writers. An occasional coarseness, sometimes attributable to the frankness of his age, is more often due to his inveterate habit of using the one word which, vulgar or not, will most pointedly express his meaning. Innumerable antitheses give a pungency almost unparalleled in sermon literature. The sentence structure is varied; it is, in general, less involved, more direct, more suited for discussion, than that of most of his contemporaries and predecessors, and the sentences are shorter; but South retains in some measure the ability of Browne and Taylor to build up long, sonorous, and occasionally obscure, sentences. South realized his ideas imaginatively, and embodied them in concrete form, as an essentially oratorical habit of mind dictates. His innumerable illustrations are mainly of a homely, familiar sort which forcefully drive home the point he is making. At the same time, he has not passed completely from the daring analogies of the seventeenth, into the matter-of-fact plainness of the eighteenth century. Saintsbury writes:

> . . . He retains that fondness for luminous if also audacious imagery which, though certainly not absent from Dryden, or even from Temple, was to be more and more restricted both in them and in their followers. His famous sentence, 'An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise,' unites seventeenth-century splendour of fancy—the sudden blaze of the imaginative rocket—with eighteenth-century balance, antithesis, and point. It can be matched with hundreds of single things, hardly less ingenious and successful. . . . [51]

South is, then, a transitional figure in the development of prose style.

South is probably more widely known for his wit than for any other quality; the *witty* Oxford divine in his commonest designation. Some injustice has been done him by this emphasis, for although his wit is a conspicuous trait, it was by no means his chief merit as a writer. The word has various acceptations; it may best be used to denominate a distinctive characteristic of South's manner in the sense of Henry Fielding's definition.

[51] *A Short History of English Literature*, N. Y. 1900, p. 444.

> By wit, Fielding means the neat and felicitous expression of thought in words and phrases that arrest one's attention. . . . What Fielding is insisting upon is that there must be seriousness and a fine perceptive sense behind all true wit. Add a certain drollery of style, and the result is Lucian, Cervantes, and Swift. . . . To give point to his conclusion, Fielding declares that the sermons and controversial tracts of Dr. South contain more true wit in union with exquisite drollery than all the comedies of Congreve.[52]

South had the same idea when he said that "Wit in divinity is nothing else, but sacred truths suitably expressed," and that "That is not wit which consists not with wisdom."[53]

This is the usual seventeenth-century meaning: intellectual keenness, not necessarily, though often, exhibited in connection with the ludicrous. Sometimes, however, South gives vent to a broader sort of comedy. Aggravatingly exaggerated descriptions of his opponents amused his auditors. He delighted in causing his enemies to loom, not as terrifying or repulsive, but ridiculous, figures. *His* satires and reproofs will ever live, said Samuel Wesley, while his foes

> "... to dark Oblivion soon were thrown:
> Thy Raileries had Wit, but Theirs had none."[54]

Sometimes he merely gives his adversaries a sly dig in passing; often he mocks them in a half-humorous, half-malicious way; more often, he is holding them up to scorn and laughter. "He sneers in the pulpit, he rails, he plays the mimic and comedian," says Taine.

Sarcasm, invective, and ridicule were terrible weapons in South's armory. Every person and principle which he opposed felt the lash of his tongue. Sometimes he deals hard, heavy bludgeon-blows; more often, he pierces with light, deadly rapier-thrusts. He can sting like a scorpion. James II had ample cause to fear for the safety of his Romish controversialists when the Earl of Rochester nominated South to be one of the Anglican champions in a debate on the *rule of faith*. James told the Earl that "he could not

[52] WILBUR L. CROSS, *The History of Henry Fielding*, Yale University, 1918, II, 446.

[53] *Works*, III, 33.

[54] "To the Memory of the Reverend Dr. South" in *Poems on Several Occasions*, Cambridge, 1743, pp. 162-167.

[55] *History of English Literature*, tr. H. Van Laun, New York, 1871, II, 65.

agree to the choice of Dr. South, who, instead of arguments, would bring railing accusations, and had not temperament of mind enough to go through a dispute that required the greatest attention and calmness."[56] The pointed pertinency of South's attacks, and the sense of a robust, self-sustaining personality which shines through his truculence, give even to coarse vituperation a real persuasive force, furnishing an edge to any line of reasoning, whether sound or unsound.

South's "Unchristian bitterness" toward his opponents, and the opinion of many that he suffered "neither sacredness of place, nor solemnity of subject, to restrain his vein of humour,"[57] are chiefly responsible for his failure to win the highest encomiums from fellow-clerics. He is "a witty preacher and scurrilous theologian";[58] and his wit and "scurrility" are responsible for the criticism that he lacks "unction" and "spirituality." One theologian concludes that "he is greater as a sermon-maker than as a genuine preacher of the gospel."[59] With South's avowed conception of the propriety of levity in a religious discourse there can be no quarrel. "The eternal salvation and damnation of souls are not things to be treated of with jests and witticisms,"[60] he observes in one place, and in another is believed to reflect on Thomas Fuller, whose wit was irrepressible. He justifies his bitterness and pugnacity by noting that the Christian's duty, upon being reviled, to revile not again, does not preclude "a due expression of asperity against the enemies of God, the king, and the public peace . . ."[61] but applies only to private injuries. It is therefore with a clear conscience that he can call his pet aversions *half-witted corporation blockheads, pragmatical pulpiteers, saucy arbitrators, sanctified dunces, scandalous exploders, blood-suckers, a pack of spiteful, mean, merciless republicans,* and *pharisaical hellish hypocrites,* to mention only a few of his choice epithets. Calvin is the great Mufti of Geneva, Milton is, "the Latin Advocate,

[56] Memoir, *Works*, lxxv. South, however, primed the men finally selected with many of their best arguments.

[57] *Wood's Life and Times*, III, Appendix I, p. 493, note.

[58] H. R. Fox Bourne, *Life of Locke*, I, 19, note.

[59] James M. Hoppin, *Homiletics*, N. Y. 1883, p. 101.

[60] *Works*, IV, 153.

[61] *Works*, V, 425.

who, like a blind adder, has spit so much poison upon the king's person and cause," and Cromwell is anything from "a piece of dirt soaked in blood," to Baal and Beelzebub. Clearly, no matter how proper South's theories are in these matters, he does violate conventional standards of ministerial decorum. Most of the criticism becomes pointless, however, if we discard preconceived ideas of the nature of Christian sermonology and think of South solely as a public speaker intent on achieving some special purpose in every speech. The post-Restoration temper of the ruling classes whom he usually addressed, vividly described by Macaulay, was such that the qualities which his later animadverters have singled out for special reproof might well have been those most responsible for his popularity and influence at the time. It was a strident age and a witty age, and perhaps religion did not suffer from an occasional mixture of raucous humour. There is some truth in the description of South as "semi-boxer and semi-buffoon";[62] the important point is, that both blows and buffoonery were effective. This is not to say that his age universally condoned his habitual manner, but merely that his party and his immediate audiences enjoyed them. And most people to-day would be glad if more preachers realized that "piety engages no man to be dull," and if more speakers acted on the principle that "No man's dulness is or can be his duty, and much less his perfection."[63]

The critic should not forget, either, that whatever the prevailing tone of South's sermons, he could speak, in moments of high seriousness and noble elevation, as movingly and as eloquently as Jeremy Taylor himself. South knew well enough that a minister should not always be a fire-eater; he condemns those "sanctified reprobationers" of the Geneva or Scotch model because "whips and scorpions, wrath and vengeance, fire and brimestone, made both top and bottom, front and rear, first and last, of all their discourses."[64] In nearly every sermon will be found passages of pathetic appeal or of calm exhortation—even in that "perfect shriek" of loyalty, the memorial sermon to Charles I, which is one of the bitterest compositions ever penned. It is worth noting that

[62] *Chronicle Observer* for 1823; quoted in *Dr. South's Select Discourses*, Boston, 1827, p. xxii, note.

[63] *Works*, III, 33 and 39.

[64] *Works*, II, 533.

a calm serenity often characterizes the final words of South's sermons. Most of them have appended to them a brief prayer from the English Litany—a prayer which is a solemn affirmation of some attribute of God. Sometimes South adapts his final sentence or sentences so that there is not even a verbal hiatus between the last words of the sermon proper and the prayer; and practically nowhere is there an emotional incongruity, for he customarily drops at the end into a quiet tone of pathos, of dignified pleading, or of simple statement. This Greek trait—the resolution of any passionate tumult in a final calm—probably owes its presence in these sermons to the homiletical tradition which imposed the benediction: a sense of harmony would not permit an abrupt break between the solemn majesty of the prayer and the words which it followed.

When, to all of the qualities which have been mentioned, we add that these sermons are stamped with those peculiarities which appear when a man is wrestling earnestly with an audience felt to be *present:* direct address, very frequent interrogation, quick changes in the form of expression, numerous personalities, the colloquialism of a highly educated man,[65] great care in refutation, and anticipation of possible objections: we can perhaps begin to realize why it is that even now, as we read, we gain the impression that the irascible Doctor is talking to us.

VII

We must think of South as a *rhetorician* if we would judge him truly, and estimate him in that capacity for which he was most peculiarly fitted. A magnificent prose style has won for him a secure place in English literature, but many of his greatest merits, even of his style, are obscured if we forget the immediate persuasive purpose which animated him in constructing each of his sermons. If we regard him simply as a minister of the gospel, we must bow to the judgment of his own fraternity, and admit that peculiarities of character weakened his usefulness. He "was corroded by his enmity to Puritan fanaticism,"[66] and made a hatred

[65] Apropos of this colloquialism, Coleridge says *(Table Talk* of July 3, 1883) that "It is quite curious to remark the prevalence of the Cavalier slang style in the divines of Charles II's time. . .. Even Barrow not infrequently lets slip a phrase here and there in the regular Roger North way. . . . South is full of it.

[66] PHELPS, *Theory of Preaching*, N. Y. 1881, p. 476.

the dominant passion of his life. Our respect mounts high indeed, however, when we estimate him as a rhetorician. His defects were defects of his age, most of them not recognised as such by his audiences of Royalists and Anglicans. His greatest merits are merits in any period. If great learning, keen reasoning, sound conceptions of public speaking, complete mastery of language, an oratorical habit of mind, profuse imagination, illuminating wit, and strong convictions are prime items in the equipment of the persuasive speaker, South deserves the title. His finest quality, perhaps, is the hard, brilliant precision with which he orders both his thoughts and the expression of them into the channels which will lead him to a predetermined goal. The authoritarian spirit which made Robert South the bitter foe of those who established conscience as the sole arbiter of conduct, which led him to teach the illegality of active resistance to the sovereign, which even induced him to attack the Royal Society,[67] exercised its most beneficent influence in determining his conception of effective and artistic composition. The God whom South worshipped was a God of order; He made the world by order, He governs it by order, and He demands a rational order in the addresses of his creatures. The great *author* of *every good and perfect gift* will "not be put off with ramble, and confused talk, babble, and tautology"; *He has no pleasure in fools.* South never attempted to put off either man or God with "ramble, and confused talk, babble, and tautology."

The most important of South's pronouncements on rhetoric and oratory will be found in the sermons listed here. They are named in what I consider to be their order of importance as sources of information about those subjects. As the sermons are arranged similarly in nearly all editions, reference is made to the number of the sermon as well as to the volume and page of the 1823 Oxford edition.

If anyone should feel moved to become acquainted at first hand with the formidable old canon, he will find characteristic merits and defects in

[67] See *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. Bray, London, p. 341. South as university orator delivered a speech at the dedication of New Theatre, and included therein an untimely attack on the newly-founded and quite respectable Royal Society, whose experimenting habits he apparently distrusted. His remarks evoked an amusing description of the speech from John Wallis, in a letter to Robert Boyle. (Robert Boyle, *Works*, London, 1772, VI, 458).

almost any sermon that he chances to read. The first four volumes (containing seventy-two sermons) were, however, carefully prepared for the press by Dr. South, whereas the discourses in the last three volumes were published posthumously and are, in general, of distinctly inferior quality.

1. Sermon XXXVII. *The scribe instructed*, etc. III, 2.

2. Sermon LIX. *Christ's promise, the support of his despised ministers.* IV, 134.

3. Sermon XV. *A discourse against long extemporary prayers.* I, 405.

4. Sermon XVI. *A discourse against long extemporary prayers: in behalf of the Liturgy of the Church of England.* I, 434.

5. Sermons XXI, LXI, LXII, LXIII. *Of the fatal imposture and force of words.* II, 108 and IV, 203, 235, and 265.

THE FORUM

TEACHING AND DOING

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

I should not be answering the letter of H. A. H. in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL for June had I not been asked by one whose wishes are as those of the king. I rather enjoyed hearing H. A. H. relieve himself; and while I thought my ox winced a bit I hoped the cattle of others were getting a worse goring. Then I half agreed with much H. A. H. said. Half agreed, I say, because, as he would probably admit, he was enjoying the luxury of half truths, so palpably half truths that many of his statements answer themselves. Anyhow I heartily agree with his desire for an embargo on more textbooks, just as soon as I get out three more. There is a reason, too, why I enjoyed the jibe at the yardstick thesis.

But I was asked to comment on his strictures on research and his contention that to gain a better standing in the academic world we must do better reading and speech-making. Here does seem ground for discussion, for we are no doubt turning more and more to research (perhaps *scholarship* would be milder, broader and better, but we will say *research)* and are probably stressing less than formerly the ability of our teachers on the platform. Perhaps the opinion of any teacher of experience has some value in this discussion, and I shall state my opinions almost as dogmatically as H. A. H. does his.

And first, I have no reason to suppose that our troubles, if any, with our colleagues, are due to their doubt that we are "authorities in our own field," as H. A. H. uses the term, referring to our ability as speakers and readers. I had supposed rather that our lack of full acceptance by some was due chiefly to doubt that our work was worth doing and to some extent to doubt that we had or our work involved sufficient scholarship for full academic rank. My belief is that our remedy lies partly in research, very slightly if at all in better speaking by us, but chiefly

in doing thoroughly well work that will be recognized, from its effects upon our students, as worthwhile.

I have no evidence that our colleagues would think more of us if we made bigger and better speeches. In my own experience I have been less embarrassed by my poor speaking than by lack of scholarship. I think it will be generally admitted that we stand better to-day than twenty years ago; yet it is only recently that young teachers have been selected in part because of scholarly work done in the field, whereas formerly they were more often chosen because they had been good student speakers, or had gone to special schools where they had received much training in reading and speaking but almost nothing of a scholarly nature. I suppose some teachers have been helped by good speech-making and some have lost standing by talking too much, or in a showy manner. And as for public reading, I should guess that taking the good and the bad together, and almost apart from the question of good and bad, public reading has lowered our academic standing. I am speaking subject to correction, which no doubt I shall get!

On the other hand, my observation leads me to believe that genuine scholarship will win us more respect than we have enjoyed in the past. I should be far from saying that all the older teachers lacked scholarship, and certainly there were some splendid teachers among them; but I do think that unfortunately for us the impressions of many of our colleagues were fixed in courses in elocution that they had in school and college. When these impressions can be overcome and when our colleagues can be given a little insight into the possibilities of our field, they are both surprised and pleased. I recall saying to the committee on graduate work at Cornell University some thirteen years ago, when they called me on the carpet to tell what I meant by having a graduate student in public speaking, "We don't know exactly where we are going, but we are on our way. We know there is much that needs doing and we hope to find out how to do it. I suppose some of you were in the same situation not so long ago." They replied in effect, "That is quite all right." And when I had told them of some of our problems as I saw them then, "as through a glass darkly," the members of the committee, historians, philosophers, economists, scientists, showed by their faces and their comments that they were seeing for the first time that there was something in our subject,

and they insisted that I remain while they voted heartily and unanimously to grant my request for the privilege of giving the master's degree. No further question was ever raised in that quarter, and seven years later the faculty of the graduate school, notably hard boiled in regard to its degrees, voted without a struggle for a Ph. D. in public speaking. These official acts and other incidents make me believe that our colleagues are glad to welcome the faintest signs of scholarship in our work. Rightly or wrongly they do believe that all academic work should be based on scholarship. In fact, I think they go too far in this and greatly underrate the value of skill.

I quite agree that shoddy research will do us only harm, and I have no doubt that some silly and pretentious work is being done. But it seems rash to imply that most of our research is a pretense to impress our colleagues. Honest efforts are being made to get a start in overcoming our ignorance of many things we should know. Will not most of us admit that we are shamefully ignorant of the underlying sciences and of the literature pertaining to our subject? If unwise things are being done, if students ill prepared and teachers untrained are splashing, we shall learn. My generation will not do much but give encouragement, but already trained men are appearing. We must not in a new enthusiasm forget that the real job for most of us is teaching, or grow impatient of the drudgery necessary to helping the individual student. Sometimes I think we are going too fast and that we should keep closer to departments of longer experience; but of the need and ultimate good of research I have no doubt.

But there is a more serious question, as no doubt H. A. H. will agree, than our standing, one on which our standing will, however, depend in the long run, and that is what will enable us to do our best work as teachers. We do have to consider our standing, but it may be that in our stuggle for a place in the sun we have become too anxious. We exhibit symptoms of an inferiority complex. Maybe it has been necessary to holler to keep our courage up; but I hope that in the future if we have to have that paper proving without a dissenting voice that we, the modern exponents of the art that was the glory of Greece and the grandeur of Rome, —I hope it will be put in one of those sections that the hotel management shunts into a bedroom at the end of a dark twisting corri-

dor on the seventeenth floor where no one but an explorer can find it. And I hope we shall settle down to the belief that our reputation, salvation, preservation and self-respect depend upon our doing our work in the best way.

Which leaves open, of course, many questions, most of which I cannot deal with in a Forum letter. One is what is our work? On this I merely point out that there are some who hold public speaking and reading only a minor division of our field. There is something to be said for this view, though it is not mine.

Wide open is the question, leaving aside the thought of reputation, whether or not the emphasis upon research is good. What I have said indicates my view that it is, though it has its dangers. As teachers we need to know more if we are to progress. We need research just as other teachers need it. For example, while I agree with H. A. H. that there are limits on what can be profitably said about the voice in a textbook, there can hardly be two opinions as to our need of more genuine knowledge of voice production.

Very wide open is the question whether one must be an exceptionally good speaker to be a good teacher of speaking. H. A. H. implies strongly that one must, especially in his last sentence where he exclaims over the absurdity of "requiring of their students an ability which their teachers have not yet acquired!" But what more familiar figure in any art than the teacher whose pupils greatly surpass him in performance. The teacher may lack physical, mental, or emotional qualities that no training can supply. A teacher of speaking may be a profound student of his subject, an excellent thinker, be well trained in the technique of speech, a discriminating critic and an excellent teacher, and yet not be a strong speaker. To select one reason, he may be too much of the reflective type, he may lack a certain expansiveness, be unable to respond easily and quickly to an audience, he may not have the peculiar type of courage required to be at his best on the platform and take command of the situation. In the jargon of the day, he may be too much of an introvert to be a strong speaker, and yet he may be a highly successful teacher. It may be just as H. A. H. says; he may have had in his youth a great admiration for oratory, a strong desire to "sway the multitude," and finding he could not do it, he may have compensated by teaching public speaking.

Well, what of that? Is there any damnation in the word "compensate"?

A young man may have a natural interest in finance, but feeling himself unfitted for the struggle of business and politics, may "compensate" by making himself an authority on "money, credit and banking." Later, without having been for a moment a financier in the usual sense of the word, he may become, like an old friend of mine, the adviser of rulers and governments in many lands.

It does not follow at all that because a man came into the teaching of speaking as a compensation that he therefore rationalizes his defects into virtues,—although we recognize, of course, that that is a possibility, just as a man who is a strong speaker may rationalize his ability into the all-important characteristic of the teacher.

A stream cannot rise higher than its source, but the old adage is not applicable. The teacher is not the source. Sometimes we say in pride and folly, "That is one of my products," but we no more make the speaker than the lapidary makes the diamond. The student's own ability, his labor and his experience, plus our teaching, make the speaker. Our part is not indispensable, as many a fine speaker proves; yet our part may be very important. We may do a speaker much harm, as by making him copy us. We can give him an opportunity to learn, we can discourage his bad qualities and encourage his good qualities, we can drill him in technique, and we can teach him many things that will enable him to profit more rapidly and more surely by experience, many things about methods of preparation, for example, and about the nature of audiences. What else? Show him how to do it, says one. Yes, within narrow limits; but that is a method calling for rare discretion, and usually sterile and limiting if made prominent.

No doubt it is a good thing for our students to hear great speakers now and then for inspiration, to gain some idea of the possibilities of public speech, and when somewhat advanced, to study their ways. But great speakers, or near great, are not hard to come at. There are always those other members of the faculty at least. No doubt it is fine to have a teacher who is at once an excellent speaker, a keen student of the subject and a helpful critic. But if we were limited to such teachers little teaching

would be done. Splendid speakers are not too numerous and they are likely to be out exercising their talents. Of course, if no others can teach, then we should quit trying; but I believe (of course, it is not the sort of thing one can prove, but H. A. H. will not complain of my failure to demonstrate; we are just swapping opinions) I believe that the man who has in him the making of an orator is less likely to have the sort of knowledge a teacher needs and to be a helpful critic than one who has to "compensate by teaching public speaking."

I should hesitate much before recommending a Bryan for an instructor, or even our "godlike Daniel." Such men would be almost sure to demand, and they would surely receive, imitation, with amusing but disastrous results. I should like to have either lecture for a week. They would make a fine advertisement and they would give us many interesting experiences and some shrewd observations, and also a lot of resounding platitudes along with great emphasis on non-essentials. Then we and the boys would hold a post mortem and decide that Bryan and Webster were great orators because they were what they were and because of this and that, but that they, the orators, did not know very well why they had succeeded and that they told us little of practical use. "Those who can't, teach," is a cheap jibe, not a whit more true than, Those who can, can't teach. It would be wonderful to hear Demosthenes in the Agora and then have him explain his methods; but still better to go with Aristotle and then discuss with him the orator's effort.

These orators may or may not know how they work out their problems; but rarely can they tell you much about yours, and often they overstress some one quality. Probably Beveridge ranks as one of the best speakers of our time, but he said several foolish things about speaking; as when he declared that the great thing is to speak always as one having authority and never to weaken this authority by making a joke, and when after several years he wrote that the great thing is to "condense, condense, condense." Instinctively he knew better for he took several hundred words to say "condense." "Do as I say, not as I do," may be an unfortunate motto; but what about "Do as I do, not as I say"?

I mean to take no extreme position here. Though I should be shy of an orator as teacher, I agree that it is desirable that the

teacher should be at least a good speaker. It will save him some embarrassment, and give him a better hold on his class. He should be a man of good speech habits, in the narrower and more correct sense. I should not like to be thought encouraging any young teacher who is failing to improve himself as a speaker. I agree that a graduate student should be expected to make himself a presentable speaker. Just how strict a requirement I should make would depend upon the total of the individual's abilities.

I am strongly of the opinion that the teacher should have practical experience as a speaker. I know a man who made a marked success as football coach in a small school and who might, in all probability, have made an outstanding coach had he cared to make coaching his business; but he never donned a football suit. I know a man who is a great dramatic coach who began without even amateur stage experience. Such instances strain the rule. Not many have the imaginative insight to overcome such lack of first-hand experience. Study and reflection interpret experience, and experience vivifies study, enabling us to dramatize all sorts of platform situations. It is more important that this experience be varied than large, and it is not necessary that it should be highly successful; although to succeed greatly must be an enlightening experience. But so is failure.

As I think over the many teachers I have known well enough to estimate their work, I am unable to trace any clear relation between success as speakers and success as teachers. When I am looking for a new teacher I inquire regarding ability as a speaker, but it is not the first or most decisive question.

I believe I have now taken up the more important of the contentions in the letter of H. A. H. But I am not quite satisfied to accept, without examination as so far I have seemed to, certain of his assumptions of fact: that we are not nearly as good speakers as our colleagues and in fact we are "terrible speakers and readers." It is particularly because we do not speak as well as our colleagues, he holds, that we are low caste. Now I have not the least idea who H. A. H. may be, and so do not know what faculty he has in mind. I have known four faculties well and do not seem to recall so many warm speakers. There are a few good speakers in any faculty. Some are born orators and some have had our instruction. Some of them are very keen men with impressive per-

sonalities and with minds packed full of interesting matter. But the fine speakers in any faculty are not many. Could we ask any better evidence than is furnished by the big guns of other faculties who come to lecture to us, especially if they lecture more than once?

We have certain difficulties as speakers. Our own subject is not particularly good for general audiences, and we are not particularly well prepared on themes of general interest. I do not think it too much to admit either that, speaking generally, the men of the best brains and most impressive personalities, have not come into our field. We may average up, but we have few of the most brilliant. It does not seem at all remarkable, therefore, if a few exceptional men in a faculty of three hundred, speaking on themes of such lively interest as may be drawn from sociology, for instance, should be able to outshine any one of the four or five men in public speaking. I doubt if we suffer by comparison with most of the faculty. Of course, when H. A. H. says no one thinks of asking one of us to speak he is just indulging in the pleasure of unrestrained exaggeration. I imagine very few of us escape invitations to speak, and invitations to us usually imply that of course the professor of speaking can make a good speech.

No doubt we should ponder the criticisms of H. A. H. and not reject them in resentment; but since we have been so sternly rebuked, it is only fair, certainly very human, to say a word in extenuation. We labor under certain difficulties as speakers. We are always under suspicion of showing off. A teacher of public speaking can hardly escape, unless he takes firm measures with the chairman, an introduction something like this: "Professor Blank teaches elocution to the boys up at the college. We have had many kinds of speakers here and we are glad to have with us to-night a man who can show how to do it right." Even the kindliest comments show that it is very hard for us to get a normal hearing, to make the audience listen to what we say rather than to watch how we say it; and many listen with malicious, and natural, pleasure in detecting faults in the "professor of speech." And our knowledge of all this induces a self-consciousness that does not help a bit. One result is that, rightly or wrongly, many of us hesitate to speak near home, especially to make anything like an "effort." Especially do we hesitate to speak in faculty meetings where we

might impress our colleagues most. If we should make a good argument, though it were in the simplest of terms, we might expect an opponent to smear it by saying, "Of course, Professor X is a fine debater and we like to hear him, but we must not be misled by his oratory." And that will last you quite a while, unless you chance to be filled with irrepressible eloquence.

Whether we are, after all, such "terrible speakers and readers" as H A H thinks depends, of course, upon one's notions of speaking. But the appeal is to what we hear at our conventions. Well, I am not going to say it is all good, though we do have much that is very good. What do we want? Last winter I heard a salesman in the corridor holding forth in condemnation of the speaking he had heard in our meetings, but praising highly one oration he had heard. "I confess," he said, "I like the old stuff. I want them to get up and let 'er go!" I like a little real oratory myself now and then; it's more than music to me. But I can take it or let it alone. I do not wish to hear orations in our working sessions. Some seem to think we go to conferences as to a fair to see hucksters display their wares. Well, if we do, I prefer a display of intellectual goods rather than of skill. But I suppose we go to confer. In the evening what you will, orations, readings, stunts, but not in working sessions.

Probably most, including H. A. H., will agree we wish straight businesslike talking; and I confess we do not always get it. We do hear dull papers badly delivered. Sometimes the fault is in the subject matter that no skill in formulation, composition or delivery could redeem. But did you ever attend the meetings of our superior colleagues? Lawyers are, as a class, as good speakers as any; yet at the meeting of the law teachers held in the same hotel with us last winter, the confusion was so great that the speakers could be heard but a few feet from the platform (my informant said ten feet!). Only men like Roscoe Pound could get a hearing. After all we do not spend our good money and precious holidays just to hear speeches; rather to meet people and swap ideas.

The trouble is not all in the speakers or their subject matter. It is not easy to speak at a convention, least of all at ours. You are asked to speak on some subject probably more important than exciting and probably complex, and to do it in say twenty-five minutes. After cutting down to thirty-five minutes what you feel

should take an hour, the chairman tells you shortly before you come on that he has had to move a certain very important speaker into your section and you will just have to cut down to fifteen minutes. Sore and worried you cut out the interesting illustrations and several main heads, write in some fake transitions and arise hoping to find your way through. The audience is exhausted by paper after paper, without the relief of discussion (apparently that cannot be helped any more; at least it isn't), and part of your hearers are wandering about asking where in the hotel is that section on stage lighting and others are leaving because fed up. Others are mumbling in a sort of oversaturation delirium. Apart from all that, we should grumble and criticise if Demosthenes and Cicero and Burke were on the program, like boarders in the best of boarding houses. It makes us feel superior and it is not quite safe to admit anything is good. And then, think: a teacher of speaking speaking on speaking before a group of professional critics of speaking! Is it any wonder that many wilt, or bluff at not trying? The argument from conventions is "not fair." It is a safe bet that most could speak 100% better before a normal audience.

One thing more I wish to say if I have to drag it in by the neck: I have no sympathy with the cry heard at every convention, if not in the meetings, then in the halls, for extemporaneous addresses. "Isn't it absurd," exclaims some one who could no doubt twitter endlessly, "that teachers of speech should come together and read papers to each other." Some more of the county fair idea, perhaps. But if there is any doubt that we could give the filibusters of the Senate cards and spades and beat them at their own game, let the doubt remain. As much discussion as possible, but when a duly appointed speaker gets up to present a hard subject I wish to know that he has thought out his problem and also has put it into good shape and that he can finish on time. A manuscript gives some hope; but if he starts without a manuscript I think it time to make for the smoking room and rely on messengers to report when he is through, if ever. One may miss some good (memorized) things that way, but they will get printed. We cannot trust many of us loose in the dictionary.

Very truly yours,

J. A. WINANS,
Dartmouth College

PERSUASIVE SPEAKING AGAIN

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: Professor Fritz, in the June QUARTERLY, presented an interesting review of J. A. McGee's new book, *Persuasive Speaking*. With many of the things said in this review I am in entire agreement, but actual experience in the use of this book as a text leads me to disagree vigorously with two points which Professor Fritz makes.

He says, "As far as style is concerned, much of the book is written below the intellectual level of the college student." It seems to me that the very simplicity and informal liveliness of the style commends it the more highly. Are text-books written for students or for their instructors? I believe that Professor Fritz is judging a student's reaction by his own, tinctured as it is with graduate study. The fact is that this is the first book we have ever used of which the student book stores sold more copies than there were students registered in classes. Perhaps Professor Fritz' students have a higher "intellectual level" than those in other colleges, but I should be willing to debate the point. No one believes more thoroughly than I do in scholarly writing in its place, but from scholarly abstractions in beginning text-books "Good Lord deliver us."

The second point on which I disagree with Professor Fritz concerns his criticism of the "motivating process." McGee uses this term as a name for the method of speech organization in which the terms introduction, body, and conclusion are discarded, and are replaced by five steps; (1) Attention, (2) Problem, (3) Solution, (4) Visualization, and (5) Action. Professor Fritz admits that this method serves to call attention vividly to each step necessary in the process of making a *persuasive* speech, but says "Where the author and I part company is where he attempts to stretch it to cover *all* speeches." He particularly objects to applying the "motivating process" to such types as the after-dinner speech, the speech of introduction, nominating speeches, and the like. My answer to Professor Fritz is that he objects because he has never tried it. He admits that Conkling's speech nominating Grant follows this order, but says this is "an exceptional instance which happens to fit." If that is true, Professor Fritz will find that Franklin Roosevelt's speech nominating Alfred E. Smith in the Houston conven-

tion just a year ago is another. Indeed, Professor Gough of DePauw University published a pamphlet several years ago outlining very nearly the same method of speech organization for eulogies. This pamphlet contains several examples to add to Professor Fritz' list of "exceptional instances." There are many others.

But even assuming that Professor Fritz is right, that these are exceptional instances, and that many speeches of the occasional type have *not* followed the "motivating process," this does not prove that the speeches might not have been more effective if they had followed it. As a matter of fact, I have found that students in my course in public address have made better speeches of introduction, welcome, information, and the like, since they have been using the "motivating process" than they did before. They now have a more suggestive procedure to follow than they did with the abstract connotation of introduction, body, and conclusion.

After all, Professor Fritz to the contrary notwithstanding, all speeches *do* have an undercurrent of persuasion in them. Speakers seek to obtain a response from an audience; regardless of the nature of the response they seek, they must use persuasion to get it. My experience with the "motivating process" is that student speeches of *all* kinds are made more effective by its use. I believe that McGee has made a valuable contribution to the field.

ALAN H. MONROE
Purdue University

THE MAX REINHARDT SCHOOL OF ACTING AND DIRECTING

Luxor, Egypt, 15 March, 1929.

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: At last comes enough of a pause in travel and in communion with the spirits that hover over Bethlehem, the Mount of Olives, Jericho, Gizeh, Karnak, Luxor, the Valley of the Kings, so that I have ambition enough at least to begin a note which may be of some interest to teachers of speech, especially those working in the dramatic field.

In Vienna a step is about to be taken which may prove to be a significant development in the educational field. For generations students of medicine have looked toward Vienna almost with the

ardor of a Mohammedan facing Mecca. Aspirants to opera and concert distinction have labored hard for the stamp "Made in Vienna." The *Burg Theater*, the *Theater an der Josefstadt* and several others have long been a bright constellation luring not only the herded caravans of conducted tourists but also students and professionals in the theatrical world. Now Vienna has a name with which to conjure, and much planning is about to culminate in the Max Reinhardt School of Acting and Directing.

There were rumors of this project in America before Mrs. Woodward and I left America last fall. Through the winter in Vienna we sought authentic information from those who were planning it and from informed but disinterested technical experts and dramatic teachers. One of Reinhardt's very intimate friends and a close adviser in the work of organizing the school is Professor Dr. M. Blaschitz. The following is an approximate translation of a statement dictated by Professor Blaschitz for us, there being yet (the middle of February) no printed prospectus or pamphlet of information.

With the *Wiener Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst* is associated a *Hochschule* with university rank to which students go who have talent and knowledge and who wish to develop this ability to a mature degree. Both institutions are under the state. In this *Hochschule* for music and dramatic art, the dramatic art has not been represented up to the present time. This training will now be provided by the School of Acting and Directing of Professor Max Reinhardt *(Schauspiel-und-Regieschule)*.

The school of directing has been thought of as a two-year course. Throughout the first year the instruction is the same as that of the students of acting. The *Regie* students (students of directing) need not themselves act or learn roles but must listen.

The course for the first year covers: roles; ensemble play; musical education of the actor; rhythm of speech, of music, of motion; art and musical history; literature and history of the theater; art and history of costume; anatomy and motion functions of the human body; mask; make-up; pantomime. (Speech technique is presumed; if the student doesn't possess it he must acquire it.)

In the second year the students of directing have their special studies or courses in: style, masks, adaptations, decoration, stage technique, lighting, source study through manuscript reading, original texts (at the National Library), preparation of stage director's books, change in cutting of texts, selection of music, practical mass psychology, independent work in cultural history

(e. g. How did an attorney in Paris in the time of the French Revolution dress, speak and deport himself? How does a devotee conduct himself in observing Catholic, Israelitish, or Mohammedan rites? How should I produce a Spanish folk-fest of the 17th century?). Further, such technical things will be taken up as the law of copyright of various countries, the rights and duties of employees, special organizations and societies, advertising, correspondence, theater engineering such as the revolving stage, disappearing effects, etc. There will also be ensemble speech practise. The students of the second-year course will be given practise in handling the students of acting in rehearsals before Prof. Reinhardt and will produce student plays. They will have the privilege of free admission to the main rehearsals of the large Vienna theaters, and if they have talent and serious-mindedness, will be permitted to attend Prof. Reinhardt's personal rehearsals. They may also be employed in connection with the Salzburg plays. There will be personal instruction by Prof. Reinhardt for at least three months of each school year. The teachers for ensemble play and rehearsal work include Dr. Geyer, Director of *Der Theater an der Josefstadt*, Paul Kalbeck, Head *Regisseur* for Reinhardt, Prof. Max Reinhardt: For costume, make-up, mask, etc., *Hofrat* Prof. Roller, Director of the Industrial Arts School, and in charge of decorative technique in the *Staatsoper* and the *Burgtheater:* for stage drawings, models, and settling, Oskar Strnad, Professor in the Industrial Arts School, and in charge of stage setting in the Reinhardt theatres of Vienna, Berlin, and Salzburg: for pantomime, Dr. Iwan Smith, who conducted for many years a large modern Russian school of acting: for source study and history of art and music, Prof. Dr. M. Blaschitz, *Hochschule für Music und darstellende Kunst:* for practical affairs of the dramatist and director, Dr. Bushbeck, of the staff of the *Burgtheater.*

The requirements for admission correspond to the requirements for admission to graduate study in an American university. Students can be accepted for second-year work who are doing practical work or who otherwise can prove their maturity. Foreign students would need to enter into correspondence about this, and have their applications acted upon upon the basis of the studies they have pursued, the work they have done, and the objectives they have in mind.

It is practicable for the students of directing at the Reinhardt school at the same time to take related courses at the University of Vienna, the schedules of classes being planned to facilitate this. Thus, with four semesters of the school of directing, the student can complete four semesters at the University and have the work of these four semesters fully accredited toward the Ph. D. degree. It is necessary for the prospective student to se-

cure acceptance of his plans in advance. His university should send directly to the University of Vienna the record of the work he has done, or he should apply directly to me, sending to me this record, on which I will gladly get the action of the University. Thus, when in Vienna, the student will find no difficulties arising later.

As to tuition, I can not give definite information until June, but it will be between $100 and $200 a year. The cost of living, of course, varies according to individual taste, but a student with modest tastes can get private *pension* for $45 or $50 a month. The libraries and museums and many of the concerts and lectures are free to students attending the state schools.

(Signed) Professor Dr. M. Blaschitz,
Boerhavegasse 15, Vienna.

This project should be significant to readers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL. One interesting thing about it is that the founders of this school aspire eventually to make work in it an avenue to the Ph.D. degree. There are other strivings toward this end in Europe. Those familiar with the work of Allardyce Nicholl in London, know his regret that instruction in the dramatic field leads to no advanced degree, that it is as yet fragmentary and inadequately equipped. In Germany the Ph. D. degree is available in dramatic work at the University of Cologne; but the work is almost entirely in dramatic literature, production being touched only theoretically. Some instruction in the field of the drama (almost entirely in dramatic literature) is available at the University of München. The University of Berlin is doing the most significant work. The heralding given the beginning there suggests at least a consciousness of a door of opportunity at which some European university should knock. It may be a long time, however, before Berlin will seriously interest advanced American students in this field. At present a student for the Ph. D. degree may, under certain conditions, be allowed some time for work that is more or less practical. This does not concern itself, however, with acting, costuming, make-up, scene-building, etc. Fragments of plays are enacted on the stage for the class (or club) and the criticism that follows concerns itself almost entirely with "grouping of the actors." So the situation was explained to me. The facilities available are utterly inadequate. The quarters are a barren recitation room with a platform about ten inches high, a part of which can be converted into a stage by use of some plain and dreary antique drapes. Fur-

niture—*beinah garnichts;* lighting—*auch beinah garnichts;* scenery—*nichts;* dressing rooms— *garkeine;* switch panels, grids, etc.,—*auch garkeine.* Any discouraged teacher of dramatics in an American university should see this place and rejoice—in the handicaps he has lamented and in the promise for education in dramatics shown by this youthful center of irritation within the scholarly conservatism of Berlin's great university.

Certainly we in America will watch the venture in Vienna with keen interest. The quarters to be used in the Reinhardt school have surroundings that are thrillingly beautiful and an atmosphere charged with an extensive and stirring history. The former court theatre in Schönbrunn, the renowned castle of the Emperors of Austria, is to be used. The elegance that departed with Francis Joseph I is no more. But much effort is made to keep up the vast and magnificent gardens with their many paths flanked by towering straight walls of sheared evergreen foliage. There should be adequate stage equipment and work rooms. In the personnel of the staff, the school offers some men with whom the students will certainly find stimulating association. And of course Vienna has an air and atmosphere of its own.

The Reinhardt school has a strategic location. It comes into the educational field at a strategic time. Surely we may all hope for its success in its effort to provide in Europe scholarly and advanced training in dramatics, and in its ambition to secure for such training the recognized degrees awarded for scholarly achievement.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD S. WOODWARD,
Western Reserve University

P. S. September 13. When I returned to Vienna in July I found that the Reinhardt School had opened in the spring, as anticipated, and had completed a semester of work. It will reopen in October for the year 1929-30.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER AND THE ANNUAL CONVENTION

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: Within the last few months we have had some unusual opportunities to meet a large number of secondary school

teachers of speech. A surprising number have asked us about the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH and just what the requirements for membership are! Also there have been questions about the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH.

These experiences have brought to our minds a suggestion which we want to pass on to every member of the profession. Maybe it's sort of a Sunday School Class or Chamber of Commerce idea and if so that's all the better reason for believing it a good one. Why not make it your objective to get a new member for the Association and thus a new subscriber for the QUARTERLY JOURNAL! And if you line up a dozen instead of one just so much greater shall be your reward and their and the ASSOCIATION's gain.

Also, while we are jotting down reminders, have you laid your plans for attending the National Convention of Teachers of Speech this coming December in New York City? Of course every secondary school speech teacher will want to be there. We need not urge college and university folk to come; they have been coming in steadily increasing numbers as they have enjoyed and profited annually from these get-togethers and fine programs.

But it has occurred to us that since there are many folk who are doing fine work in the field of speech in the secondary schools who have not closely aligned themselves with the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, it is also likely that there are a great number who have not become interested in the annual National Convention. We wish to suggest to each reader that no opportunity be lost to tell, write, or radio other colleagues and friends urging them to be present at the coming convention. Last year more secondary school folk attended than ever before and it was very largely because many interprising and loyal members of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION extended such personal invitations, recommendations, and urges. We hope no one is going to overlook these possibilities of service this year.

Hoping to see you at the convention,

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT,
Syracuse University
Chairman of the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools.

THE SERVICE BULLETIN

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: The Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools plans to issue in the near future a Service Bulletin for Teachers of Speech. This bulletin will aim to be intensely practical, and will contain numerous hints and suggestions, written by well-known authorities, concerning the teaching of the various speech courses and the coaching of extra-curricular activities. The Service Bulletin will specialize in articles which by their very nature can seldom be used in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH or other speech journals, but which are of timely, immediate value to teachers of speech. Although the Committee is largely interested in secondary school problems, the material found in the Service Bulletin will, we hope, be helpful to every speech teacher whether in primary, secondary, or collegiate work.

Through the generous financial contribution of Dean Ralph Dennis of Northwestern University, the financial director for the Committee, a trial copy of the Bulletin will be mailed without charges to any teacher of speech who will write one of the editors, requesting a copy. If you are interested, write us immediately.

The Committee is perfectly willing to admit that this venture is an experiment. But we believe that there is a place for such a bulletin. We shall welcome your suggestions. How may this publication render the greatest service? What type of material should be stressed? We urge you to write us soon, giving in some detail your plan for making the bulletin practical, helpful, invaluable.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN H. PAGET,
North Carolina State College
AND
JOHN A. MCGEE
Purdue University
Co-editors of the Service Bulletin
for Teachers of Speech.

NEW BOOKS

[New Books are sent to staff reviewers, but voluntary contributions are gladly considered. Manuscripts should be sent to Hoyt H. Hudson, Review Editor, Princeton University.]

Andrew Johnson. By Lloyd Paul Stryker. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929: pp. 881.

That Andrew Johnson played a leading role in one of the most exciting dramas ever enacted in America has never been denied, but whether he was the hero or the villain of the piece has long been and doubtless for some time will continue to be a subject of debate. Mr. Stryker, in this massive and thoroughly documented biography, not only makes Johnson the hero but casts as villains all his opponents, including Horace Greeley, Wendell Phillips, Charles Sumner, General Grant, and James Russell Lowell. Though he consequently weakens his argument by overstatement, he completely annihilates the myth that Andrew Johnson was a weakling. The brawny Tennessee tailor that emerges from these pages a man of unquestionable intelligence, honesty, firmness, and courage.

The fact that such a man failed so utterly to thwart the pernicious activity of a Congress bent on destroying the Constitution as well as the South calls for considerable explanation. Mr. Stryker side-steps this difficulty by adopting the thesis that anyone else, even Lincoln, would have been similarly "crucified." I believe he does Lincoln an injustice. Lincoln, unlike Johnson, was a consummate politician and an acute rhetorician.

Johnson's lack of political shrewdness is evident in his refusal to gain adherents by judicious appointments. His was a noble ideal; no one but a strong man would have clung to it through the chaotic period of Reconstruction. But the result was disastrous: the government, from the Cabinet down, became filled with his enemies. That Lincoln would have followed such a policy is unthinkable. In fact, one of Mr. Stryker's most tactful passages explains that Johnson found it necessary to repudiate several promises of appointments made by Lincoln in return for political sup-

port. Johnson, again, did nothing to help the Conservative Republicans in Congress, whose lack of organization and leadership Mr. Stryker several times deplores. Lincoln, it seems evident, would have taken steps to unite his friends for effective action.

If Johnson's political blunders were serious, his rhetorical ones were even worse. It seems almost unbelievable that he should have had so little success in persuading the American people to uphold his policies. For he was a trained speaker; a close student of Burke, Pitt, and Fox; an orator without a peer on the stump and with few superiors in a Senate that included Stephen A. Douglas, William Seward, Charles Sumner, and Jefferson Davis; and so able a master of argument that his state papers have been called by one whose word should carry weight (James D. Richardson, editor of *A Compilation of Letters and Messages of the Presidents)* inferior only to those of Jefferson and Lincoln. His failure is the more surprising when one remembers, as Mr. Stryker takes pains to make clear again and again, that throughout the great battle with the Radicals he was in the right. The Civil War tested the right of a state to secede. The victory of the North established the illegality of secession. Therefore Johnson, following Lincoln, contended that after the war the Southern states were still members of the Union and could have "no other legal status." To consider the South out of the Union was to concede that the war had been fought in vain. Johnson's stand was logically impregnable. Yet, in spite of all he could do, Congress passed over his vetoes bill after bill assuming the indefensible position that the Southern states were "conquered territory."

The key to the problem is that Johnson (and here again he differed from Lincoln) could never adapt himself to his real audience, the whole American people. His arrows never quite hit the mark; he aimed sometimes too low, sometimes too high. When he met an audience face to face, he let hecklers lead him into hasty and undignified retorts, which pleased the immediate crowd but disgusted newspaper readers. For instance, a heckler in St. Louis, during the "swing around the circle" of 1866, called him a Judas. His retort was: "If I have played the Judas, who has been my Christ that I have played the Judas with? Was it Thad. Stevens? Was it Wendell Phillips? Was it Charles Sumner? These are the men that stop and compare themselves with the Saviour." He

received, naturally, thundering cheers from the crowd and a torrent of hostile criticism from the press. When, on the other hand, he sent messages to Congress, where he knew they would not be heeded, he adopted a policy which Professor Shorey and Mr. Simrell would applaud—he argued logically, clearly, emphatically, but without a trace of emotional appeal. This, he fondly believed, would influence the people to repudiate their representatives! The people failed to respond, of course. Unadorned logical argument —and it was first-rate argument, as a perusal of the many extracts in Mr. Stryker's book will make evident—proved an untrustworthy weapon in this very real crisis.

Perhaps Lincoln could have done no better. Yet I have a feeling that he could have found a way to show Northern business men the folly of ruining an important market, or to make vivid the horrible consequences of stirring up race prejudice, or to dramatize the conflict between the Radicals and the framers of the Constitution. At least he would not have allowed the controversy to become a personal matter between himself and his detractors, nor would he have let a handful of subsidized hecklers put him on the defensive and make him ridiculous in public. Andrew Johnson had virtues—great virtues. He did as much as a Woodrow Wilson could have done in his place. But, like Wilson, he lacked the sense of communion with the popular temper which was a basic trait of Lincoln. That was not Johnson's fault; it was his tragedy.

RAYMOND F. HOWES,
Washington University

Better Speech. BY CHARLES HENRY WOOLBERT AND ANDREW THOMAS WEAVER. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., Revised and Enlarged Edition, 1929: pp. v, 463; $1.52.

Here is a revision worthy the name, a better *Better Speech!* The authors have written truly in the Preface: "This book is planned throughout to enable teachers representing the widest variety of training to offer instruction in the basic principles and techniques of good speech." No teacher in the field can afford not to have read this book. Even the reviewer has read every one of the 449 pages of subject matter, including the approximately

190 pages of readings, illustrations, projects, and exercises liberally inserted wherever they will be most useful. And there is an eleven-page accurate index.

If any doubting educator would but read this book he would see so clearly the tremendous benefits, the continual usefulness of a speech course based upon such a text, that he surely would elevate speech training at once beyond mere recognition to its rightful place of prominence in the curriculum. Would that every teacher, before being granted a teacher's certificate, might be required to read the excellent and long-needed chapter on "Discussion in the Classroom"! This is a lasting contribution to educational literature.

Here are a few of the many comments I jotted down as I read the book:

I find the first group of exercises for voice improvement that has ever appealed to me as being completely usable. The phonetic approach is made with a most appreciative understanding of high-school pupil psychology; for instance, the demonstrated spelling of *potato:* gheauphtheighttough. As an example of the common sense viewpoint, this is written concerning pronunciation: "Do not emphasize differences that exist—and they are in reality very few—so that you attract undue attention to your speech." Continuing to state the second test of good speaking as "at all times plain to the eye and to the ear" takes no cognizance of the radio speech. Thinking of Burke and Wilson, one wonders at the unqualified statement italicized on page 11: "The speaker who in the shortest time and with the least effort for everybody concerned can induce those whom he addresses to do what he wants them to do is the best speaker."

Considering speech preparation, there is proper stressing of the audience. Speech outlines are still well handled. There is a brief treatment of the "oratorical-contest speech." The coming extempore-contest speech is one of few subjects overlooked. Everywhere, one finds interesting up-to-date illustrations which even the indifferent pupil will read, and, having read, cannot help profiting by. The book provides continual stimulating challenge to the pupil's imagination, knowledge, and broadening interests.

Debate and dramatics are no longer relegated to appendices. The definition of "issues" is very vague. Why is there no treat-

ment of finding material? There are eight pages of suggestions for the director, as to sources of every kind of material for dramatics. The delightfully well-written chapter on interpretative reading suggests a wealth of selections. "How the Voice Works" is the first dependably accurate chapter on this phase of speech available in a secondary-school textbook. Here is an interesting statement: "Vowels make speech heard; consonants make it understood. There may be good singers whose words it is difficult to understand, but there are no good speakers like that." (p. 353). Exercises showing the importance of voice to meaning are splendid. Most valuable additions to the original text: chapters on "Kinds of Speeches and Methods of Delivery" and "Discussion in the Classroom." Unfortunate omissions: the contrast between written and oral language, and a consideration of improvement of memory.

I must make one major criticism, not of the book, but of its use as suggested in the Preface. Why recommend it for advanced courses in specific phases of speech? It is belittling indeed, to the entire speech field if the inference is to be drawn that all necessary specific subject matter for a special course in extempore speaking, dramatics, debating, or interpretative reading may be found within the respective single chapters devated to these in *Better Speech.* Nor can such an attitude receive respectful consideration from educators. The book provides sufficient and accurate material in both subject matter and exercises for three semesters of basic speech study and training. But beyond that the reviewer cannot second the recommendation of the authors,—highly though he admires the revised *Better Speech for the purpose primarily intended.*

Come to know this book and you will find it so useful that its condition will soon be as dilapidated from hard usage, as is my copy of the first edition. And it is splendidly substantial, too! Everyone will find it helpful, refreshing, stimulating. Speech training in secondary schools owes much to the fortunate completion of the revision *Better Speech* by Professor Woolbert and Weaver before the former's untimely death.

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT,
Syracuse University

Speaking in Public. By Arleigh B. Williamson. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1929: pp. xvi, 412.

The state of instruction in Public Speaking, if gauged by the number of text-books produced, must be very flourishing indeed. It will soon be a mark of distinction for a teacher in our field, not to have written a book. This is not to say, however, that all books appearing are unnecessary. A case in point is Professor Williamson's *Speaking in Public,* which is mainly a sound piece of work, useful to anyone who has to learn to speak, teachable, and not without certain claims to originality of treatment.

The book is, as its title implies, squarely planted in the field of public discourse. It does not look several ways at once. It does not even deal with the problem of speech, narrowly defined. It attends strictly to methods of preparing and delivering speeches before audiences. After a brief introduction the author divides his subject into five parts (the number is reminiscent of the five departments of the Latin rhetorics). The first has to do with initial physical difficulties, the second with posture, gesture and platform conduct, the third with oral delivery and voice, the fourth with speech composition, and the fifth with means of securing action. No doubt this arrangement will not please every one: some may feel the order is wrong, others that an improper emphasis on body is suggested. It is to be noted, however, that the sections on speech composition and action exceed by some thirty pages the first three sections combined.

It is certainly no defect that the book seems to adhere to no particular school of thought in our field, that it adapts no single system of psychology (although Overstreet's *Influencing Human Behavior* seems to be a favorite with the author), and that it evolves no ingenious or novel thesis. It is eclectic—in the best sense. In the main Professor Williamson has selected good topics, and has set good problems for solution. If we recognize here and there familiar dicta, in the discussion and illustration of them the author's stamp is clearly visible.

Among the features which are comparatively novel, are these: an interesting discussion of mental hygiene in connection with the chapter on "Initial Difficulties and How to Meet Them"; an adaptation of speech to the audience through gesture, in Chapter Five,—less convincing, perhaps, for this seems a matter in which

conscious attention can scarcely aid; and a thorough discussion of the three modes of developing thought in a speech—by exposition, narration, and argument. This last has little in it which cannot be found in the older rhetorics, but the idea of discussing these forms of composition as methods of amplification is unusual, and sound.

Some ideas and methods, in this, as in almost every work of its kind, are open to question. Such is the advice that "After the salutation, in the delivery of his opening remarks, the speaker should talk more loudly, in general than he may need to through most of his speech." Whether or not the old doggerel advice, "Begin low, speak slow, etc.", is in point here, many feel that the advice to begin loudly is dangerous. It is likely to lead to an unconversational attitude in general, and to monotony or over-aggressiveness in particular. The chronological outline on page 247 is chaotic and lacks much of measuring up to the logical outlines that follow; it would better be omitted. The tacit assumption in Chapter Nine that classroom speakers should speak only on campus topics is very questionable. The exercises in the chapters on "Oral Delivery" and "Getting Rid of Vocal Monotony" are somewhat stereotyped and of doubtful pedagogical worth.

These are, after all, but minor blemishes. As a whole the book is to be ranked above most that have appeared in the last few years. One virtue not to be overlooked is the perspicuity and dignity of style maintained throughout. Distinctive and interesting the style is not, but the merits of clearness and good English are of more importance in a text-book. The book is handsomely bound and printed in large, clear type.

RUSSELL H. WAGNER,
Cornell University

Our Inheritance, Speeches and Addresses. BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE STANLEY BALDWIN. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran: 1928, pp. 349.

The public man of today, whatever his office, cannot confine to legislature, to campaign oratory, or even to politics and government the large number of speeches he is expected to make. Pitt could determine to do all his speaking in parliament. The present-

day Pitts, and lesser men, as a supplementary but quite necessary part of their official duty, must be ready to make frequent speeches, almost anywhere and upon any subject. They must expect to address any audience that wants to hear a few words from the honorable So-and-So and has enough political or social importance to command his presence. Under no conditions can they resist for long the insistent demand that they be seen and heard at dedications, at conventions, at clubs, at dinners,—in short, wherever their presence could possibly be construed to add dignity or significance to the occasion.

Usually their speeches on these occasions get no more than perfunctory press notice. Sometimes, however, they are edited and published, and are thus called forcibly to our attention. Such a collection is the present one, re-edited from the daily Press reports of what Stanley Baldwin, then Prime Minister of England, had to say on various non-political occasions during the years 1926-1927. It contains some forty-three speeches and extracts, varying in length from two to twelve or fifteen pages, and delivered on such occasions as: The Unveiling of a War Memorial at Harrow, A dinner of the Chamber of Shipping, A dinner of the Cambridge Conservative Association, The Saint David's Day Banquet at Cardiff, To the Royal Society, and many others of similar types. One hundred sixteen pages are devoted to selected speeches made during Baldwin's Canadian tour in 1927. They represent a type in many ways different from the scattered addresses composing the remainder of the volume, and would furnish material for an interesting study beyond the present purpose; not for what they say, but for what they are: the fruits of an attempt of the Prime Minister of England to carry to the Canadians, on the festive occasion of their Diamond Jubilee Celebration, a genial message of interpretation (really, vindication) of England, and to leave with them his *sursum corda*.

Appropriately to the time, place, and audience, most of the speeches strictly avoid contentious subjects. Many of them contain little more, as Baldwin tells the Annual Meeting of the Union of Girls Schools (p. 245), than his attempt to 'look in and bless' this or that gathering. In two or three of the Canadian speeches, and at Chippenham, however, he discusses the industrial situation in England and the General Strike. Then it is, because of his of-

ficial position and his wide experience in industry, that he has something substantial to say and a point of view to set forth. Even so, he does not argue, as he might in Parliament. He explains matters from his own point of view, giving to his audiences, *ex cathedra,* the correct interpretation of things as they are. Where there is a real attempt at persuasion, his chief weapons are bold assertion, plausible fallacy, and the supporting force of his own seeming soundness and intense patriotism. Logical proof he avoids as either useless or unecessary. Generalizations compose the substance of his talk,—generalizations frequently pregnant with discussion which Baldwin assiduously omits. If there is argumentative force, it is of the type designed rather to encourage friends than to conquer opponents.

Much of the lack of solid substance, reasoning, and orderly structure may be attributed to, if not excused by the occasions. After-dinner speeches and others closely akin makes up the larger part of the collection. The Prime Minister's mere presence usually would have been enough. His audiences were friendly, receptive, and willing to be satisfied with a modicum of illumination. Perhaps Baldwin's mistake is that on occasions which are decidedly not of after-dinner nature, he persists in his after-dinner manner. He attempts, often rather absurdly, to speak to his audiences in their own language, but his knowledge carries him not quite far enough, and leads him into conventional medical, scientific, or artistic talk, and into the usual common-places which ought to occur to anyone under similar circumstances.

Hater of rhetoric and oratory as he has repeatedly declared himself, he has developed several obvious rhetorical tools, not the least effective of which is his practice of denouncing rhetoric, and of declaring himself the plain blunt man who is devoted to unadorned truth and 'prefers to lower the temperature of political life by very often putting his thoughts into a refrigerator' (p. 303)—a device of which Shakespeare's Antony would not have been ashamed.

In spite of his protestations, his style is far from unadorned and colorless. He is profuse in illustrations, which sometimes he leaves dangling, unclinched. He makes apt use of quotations from literature and history, tending to heighten the tone of his otherwise casual speaking. Perhaps one feels that he overworks the last

words of nurse Cavell and Socrates. His language is generally familiar and conversational, often humorous, even flippant, but it bears the touch of much reading in classical literature and the English Bible. He indulges regularly in metaphor, sometimes awkwardly, but generally well. His favorite figure represents government as a wheel, one spoke of which is democracy, another anarchy, etc. His speech to the Medical Association is a rather absurd metaphor in which politicians appear as doctors of state. Occasionally, too, he makes good use of epigram. To the Canadians he says: 'We are overwhelmed by history, and you by geography.' His style, jerky and casual though it frequently is, especially when read, is probably his chief virtue. It represents an attempt to get into communication with his audiences.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
New York State College for Teachers

Modern Dramatic Structure. By DOROTHY JUANITA KAUCHER, Ph. D., The University of Missouri Studies, Volume III, No. 4, October 1928.

Readers of this study must bear in mind the author's statement of purpose in the Introduction.

> The title *Modern Dramatic Structure* may be a misnomer, because the term *modern* may suggest more to some than this study attempts to analyze; and, at the same time, it may not suggest one of the vital elements of this discussion,—the well-made play of Eugene Scribe and those who followed his formula exactly. The real purpose of the chapters which follow is, first, an analysis of the well-made play, and, secondly, an examination of some aspects of modern applications of its technique as well as departures from it.... The purpose of this discussion is not only to show that some modern plays have departed greatly in subject matter and technique from the Scribe plays, but also that, in this departure, the dramatist has not always profited by throwing overboard the neat Scribe mechanism, which, in spite of its faults, is justifiable on certain grounds.

Apart from the one page each given to the Introduction and the Conclusion the work is divided into the following six chapters, the headings of which are indicate of its scope and its intentional omissions: 1, The Well-Made Play; 2, The Russian Revolt against

the Scribe Formula; 3, Gerhart Hauptmann; 4, The Scandinavians; 5, George Bernard Shaw; 6, Eugene O'Neill.

The opening chapter is excellent in its analysis of the well-made play and in the abundance of illustrative material offered. The latter feature is maintained throughout the study. Citations from the plays discussed are made so copiously that the author's points are clear to readers who may be unacquainted with or but dimly remember them. The satisfactoriness of the later chapters depends upon the reader's sharing the author's particular interest in making the Scribe formula an architectural touchstone, as indicated in the last sentence quoted above from the Introduction. To the present reviewer they do not offer a wholly clear and complete exposition of the structural technique of the playwrights treated. The emphasis placed upon dramatic devices leaves an impression of the texture rather than the essential structure of the plays. Ibsen's fondness for basing his plays upon antecedent situations is treated, in the author's phrase, as the device of 'retrospective analysis' and its effectiveness in the gradual unfolding of exposition is contrasted with Scribe's method. Dr. Kaucher speaks very justly of Ibsen's artistry here, yet, in respect to structural values, the line of comparison runs far back of Scribe to the Greek tragic poets. The chapter on O'Neill is valuable for its examination of his methods in achieving his dramatic effects but it leaves not proven the implication of the Introduction that his faults may be attributed to his 'throwing overboard the neat Scribe machanism'.

Dr. Kaucher summarizes her position as follows: "Scribe overemphasized form; some modern dramatists, going to the opposite extreme, lay too great stress upon the release of the human spirit. Between these two extremes are such masters as Ibsen and Tolstoi, whose technique includes both the mechanical and the spiritual."

The extensive bibliography indicates the plays considered in the discussion. The work of Wilde, Barrie, Molnar, O'Casey, Milne, Werfer, Kaiser, Capek, Green and Rice does not appear in it.

PHILIP HICKS,
Swarthmore College

Beneath the Crust of Words. By Louis Foley. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1928: pp. v, 158.

This is a collection of interesting and not unduly academic discussions of a dozen or more topics lying within the field of rhetoric. "Argument by Metaphor" is perhaps the essay which should interest the greatest number of readers of the Quarterly Journal. In it Mr. Foley emphasizes the familar proposition that figurative analogies do not logically prove but rather rhetorically impress. In this, as elsewhere in the volume, widely chosen illustrative material enhances the value of the discussion. In "The Split Infinitive" the author takes his hand arbitrarily against the beast, in spite of all great names to the contrary. In "Of Possession" he leans over backward in opposing the group possessive, an established English idiom; "the King of England's palace," he says, is wrong, but he will not find many people going along with him. Other recommended essays are "What are Figures?" "The Allurement of Alliteration," and "Development through Ignorance." H. H. H.

John Wesley: A Portrait. By Abram Lipsky. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1928, pp. 305.

The Lord's Horseman. By Umphrey Lee. New York: Century Co., 1928, pp. 358.

In writing *Man the Puppet,* the art of controlling minds, Mr. Lipsky equipped himself with an excellent background for treating a religious revival as a problem in rhetoric. His life of John Wesley is an admirable study of the work of a great rhetorician. Mr. Lipsky offers a keen psychological analysis of Wesley's character and the sources of his emotional power. The analysis of Wesley's audiences is of equal significance for the rhetorician. The chapters on spell-binding and revival technique are typical of the point of view of the whole book.

Umphrey Lee's *The Lord's Horseman* is another attempt to apply a modern point of view to the mass of material which must be gone over in any serious effort to understand John Wesley and his work. The book is not so clearly focussed as Mr. Lipsky's. It is very readable, however, and contains particularly interesting appendices from the papers of John Wesley. Neither of these books is devastating. E. L. H.

The Oral Study of Literature. By Algernon Tassin. New York: Knopf, 1929: pp. 483.

This text, previously reviewed in the Journal, now appears in its third revision. Mr. Tassin has dropped about forty selections and has added some fifty others. The reviewer has used the *Oral Study of Literature* in his classes for several years and believes it to be notable for an unusual combination of general literary excellence, intellectual significance, and variety of problems in oral interpretation. Some of the ideas in the introduction and the lessons were the subject of spirited controversy at the Princeton meeting of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference. A future revision, perhaps, will not be so concerned over a lack of appreciation for the subject of interpretative reading.

E. L. H.

The Public International Conference. By Norman L. Hill. Stanford University Press, 1929: pp. 267.

Mr. Hill has familiarized himself thoroughly with the proceedings of the various international conferences since the war, and has organized his material clearly under significant heads. He is also able to give a competent summary of the earlier conferences. Of especial interest to the rhetorician is the treatment of the deliberative nature of the conferences, publicity at conferences, and the future of conferences. Mr. Hill's understanding of the functions and limitations of public conferences, together with his intelligent critical commentary on needed improvements make the book especially valuable to students of public opinion.

E. L. H.

OLD BOOKS

Lectures on Pulpit Eloquence. By George Campbell. London, 1824: pp. xiv, 344.

Campbell's *Pulpit Eloquence* is not, at present, so well known as his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, first published in 1776. Yet it was several times reprinted and must have been deservedly popular in the early part of the last century. When the first edition was printed I cannot determine. Two editions are in the British Museum, those of 1807 and 1840. In both of these his *Lectures on Systematic Theology* are included, and in my copy, 1824, eight lectures on the work of the pastor and on systematic theology preface the twelve on eloquence.

The earlier work on rhetoric contains, in two volumes, Campbell's complete system of oratorical theory, with only passing reference to ecclesiastical problems. In the *Pulpit Eloquence* he adapts his theory to the needs of preachers. The lectures are on such subjects as the importance of studying the subject, expression, pronunciation, the choice of subjects and texts, and discourses distributed into kinds. The last mentioned topic, the kinds, are given in the *Philosophy of Rhetoric* as those addressed to the understanding, the imagination, the passions, and the will. In this work they turn into the explanatory, the controversial, the commendatory, and the pathetic types of sermons.

The sources for this work, and for the earlier one, too, we presume, were mainly those mentioned in the first lecture. Here Campbell says that all that is valuable in every modern "institute" on the rhetorical art is "servilely copied from Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, in whose writings, especially Quintilian's Institutions, and Cicero's *de inventione*, those called *ad Herennium* and his dialogues *de Oratore*, every public speaker ought to be conversant." He adds to this list Longinus on the Sublime and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, "and some others." For the theory and practice of pulpit eloquence he recommends Rollin, Fenelon, Blair, and a Mr. Farquhar.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the work is this first chapter, in which an art of preaching is defended against those who maintain that exhortation from the pulpit is a miraculous gift. While not denying that it may have been so to the Apostles, Campbell asserts that such a gift cannot be expected in modern times. He very effectively turns the tables by asking why any learning at all is required of the minister, if his training is to be modeled on that of the Apostles? Would the opponents of rhetorical training send missionaries to the heathen without lexicons, grammars, and the like, expecting them to be given the gift of tongues on their arrival at a foreign land?

In the adaptation of his own earlier work and of the classical theory of eloquence which is common to both rhetorical works, Campbell succeeds because of wise selection, frequent illustration, and by practicing the virtues of succinctness and brevity. There is no inept attempt to use those parts of a framework which do not apply to the task in hand.

The most distinctive feature of the book is the fact that Campbell has a theory of preaching differing from that found in the scriptures or that in use commonly in his day. He favors the use of a text, in opposition to those who argued that texts were not found in scriptural sermons, but has quite independent views on the use to be made of a text in the sermon. He even ventures to warn his readers that the sermons of Jesus, consisting, as they do, of simple parables and unadorned precepts, are inadequate models for present-day preachers.

One could collect countless *sententiae* from this condensed product of ripe wisdom. A few typical ones will indicate the sound and enduring nature of the advice given:

It is the business of the orator to accomodate himself to men, such as he sees they are, and not such as he imagines they should be.

When we recommend the ordinary tone of the voice in conversation, as that on which we ought in public to attempt to speak, we would not be understood to recommend an insipid monotony; we only mean to signify, that this should serve as the foundation note, on which the general tenour of the discourse should run.

A key to the state of education of the Scottish clergy is the doubt expressed in the first chapter of the Introductory Discourses as to whether or not the lectures on theology should be given in

Latin. Campbell also records that only a short time before disputations in Latin had been required of prospective clergymen, and that it was still the custom for the candidate to deliver a Latin exegesis, in which "all the arguments are cast in one or other of the moulds with which Aristotle's Analytics have furnished us."

RUSSELL H. WAGNER,
Cornell University

Contemporary Speeches

PHILIP SNOWDEN: *Speech at The Hague,* August 6, 1929.

The Illustrated London News of August 17, in a large photograph, shows the setting and audience of Snowden's important speech, which, supplemented by his other speeches and communications, has had such an effect in European affairs. The photograph shows that he spoke at a table, about which were seated some thirty diplomats, with perhaps forty other men seated in the room and representatives of the press in the gallery. It also shows Snowden himself, "loaded for bear" as he was, leaning forward in his chair much as we have seen many a college debater awaiting his introduction. The speaker was a man of sixty-five, already known as a super-accountant with an insatiable appetite for figures and as an incisive debater in the House of Commons. His rise to influence despite physical handicap, his grim hard-set face, his having "a sharp tongue but a kind heart," and his tremendous capacities for intellectual labor, have in recent months passed into legend.

Snowden waged at The Hague a battle simultaneously on two fronts—the domestic and the foreign. His immediate objective was on the foreign front, but it is entirely possible that the major offensive was directed toward establishing the Labor government at home. The brusque manner and the intransigence which he maintained throughout the negotiations may have jeopardized his success among the diplomats and the popularity of his government abroad; but win or lose there, his stand was calculated to win at home. Even had he gone back without the additional two million pounds a year, he would have won for himself and his government Great Britain's admiration for British pluck. The conservative *Saturday Review* immediately after Snowden's first speech referred to it as "this outburst so shocking to the respectabilities of British public life, so expressive of the conviction of the British people."

To shock was Snowden's purpose, a factor in his technique. He knew that a storm turning suddenly can look like a snake. He called attention to his brusqueness by apologies for it. "I hope for your forgiveness," he said early in the short speech, "for my frank and plain speaking, but this division is utterly indefensible, and the experts did not attempt to explain or justify it." He rightly adopted the method of plain statement, the idiom of one speaking necessary facts; so that his hearers had a sense of listening to the very voice of economic history. He was personal only when he begged pardon for the constraint he was under. Yet his personality was working for him every moment of the time he spent at The Hague.

So far as he used other "artificial" proofs, Snowden rested his case upon the settlements made at the Spa Conference of 1920 and upon Article 237 of the Versailles Treaty, which provides that once the division of reparations was decided upon, it should not be changed. He pointed out also that in eight conferences after 1920 no change in percentages had been suggested. His conclusion on August 6, with its shrewd reference to the proposed cancellation of all debts, well sums up the man and his position:

"Recapitulating: the British government points out its objections: First, to the distribution of the unconditional and conditional payments; second, to the alteration of the Spa percentage; third, to the deliveries in kind.

"Forgive me if I speak with great firmness. The House of Commons would never agree to any further sacrifice of British interests, and there is no party division there. All parties of England agree they are prepared to wipe the slate clean of all international debts, and all reparations. That was proposed by the Balfour note and the declaration of our party before coming into power. As long as reparations are paid and received, and as long as the debt is payable to Great Britain, every succeeding government will insist on Great Britain being fairly treated."

Most speakers would have needed a "But" at the beginning of the last sentence. Evidently Snowden's delivery took care of the transition. Lloyd-George would have used more words throughout, would have wrapped the whole in moral and personal considerations. But he also would have left loopholes of escape for himself, and when pressure came from all Europe's diplomats he would have availed himself of one. Snowden cast up no screens of smoke or dust, but openly set his back against a solid wall and

fought. The novelty of this technique in diplomatic skirmishes was one factor in its success.

HOYT H. HUDSON,
Princeton University

RAMSAY MACDONALD: *Speech before the League of Nations Assembly,* September 3, 1929. New York *Times,* September 4.

Premier MacDonald's address furnishes excellent warrant for the Englishman's reputation for being able to combine the persuasiveness of informal discourse with the eloquence of making just the right point at just the right time. As in the present instance, it is a reputation earned mainly by parliamentarians rather than exhibition orators and largely by citizens of Great Britain coming from these portions of the Isles, lying north and west of England, whose people are generally noted for their love of discussion.

The achievement seems to depend upon having a genuine climax, not reaching it prematurely nor preparing for it too obviously, and having enough of importance to say after the climax to consolidate the effect.

Mr. MacDonald began his address with a conventional observation that many changes had taken place since the meeting of the League Assembly in 1924, took friendly notice of the German delegation's presence and the retirement of Mr. Camerlynck, the Assembly's translator, and finally, in not too business-like fashion, suggested getting down to business:

> A very witty Englishman once said, remarking about castles in the air, that the right place for castles was in the air and that what men on earth ought to do was to build up foundations in order that the castles might be supported.
>
> To a certain extent the pact of peace is still a castle in the air, and the Assembly of the League is going to build up the foundations to support this castle.

But then instead of hurrying into matters of importance he devoted himself to praising the work of the Hague conference, which had just been completed, paying a special compliment to the Belgian prime minister, who as presiding officer of the conference had been its chief "peacemaker"; in short, very tactfully soothing the feelings that had been hurt by the bullying of his colleague, Mr. Snowden, and so preparing a friendly atmosphere for his own affairs. That done, he discussed at length the problem of disarma-

ment, giving an impression of generous committal without actually committing himself to anything. This was managed partly by making generalities with great frankness (e. g., "one of the greatest risks of war is that some of us—all of us—are still too heavily armed") and partly by extensive but nebulous explanation of the Anglo-American "conversations" on naval armaments. One paragraph of this explanation is a perfect specimen of the art of seeming to say something without saying anything:

> Our conversations have not yet been ended, but the agreement has gone very far. I do not quite know what form it will take and can say nothing at the moment that would in any way hamper President Hoover in his work, but I think we might produce a document that would have something like twenty points of agreement in it, a very comprehensive document. We are not out for small things; we are out for a document which will establish peace as well as agree to naval ratios.

All of which is putting lead nickels in the collection plate.

Then came a brief transition, a good-natured reference to the inevitability of disagreements and the necessity of conciliation as exemplified by the recent Hague conference, and, almost abruptly, the climactic announcement that the British government had decided to sign the optional clause of the League of Nations pact accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in international disputes. The Assembly's applause, which had previously been scattering and infrequent, was here described by the *Times* reporter as "general" and "strong." The English Conservative press was unanimously disapproving when the news got back home, and the Liberal press was lukewarm, but the number of nations that followed his lead came near justifying Mr. MacDonald's hope that this session should be known as the "Optional Clause Assembly."

The speech was only a little more than half completed with this announcement, but the enthusiasm of the audience was maintained to the end. The matters which followed, while comparatively remote and complex and so wisely placed after the climax, were significant enough to prevent any sense of letdown. Recognition of the new nationalism of the East, a statement of policy toward mandates in general and the troubles in Palestine in particular, and approval of M. Briand's ideal of economic coöperation among the nations of Europe, comprised the rest of the body of the address.

The peroration was a strong dose of self-preservation in a solution of emotional idealism.

Although the substance and structure of the speech were more noteworthy, the phraseology was certainly no handicap. There was little attempt at slogan-making, "risks of peace" being the chief and almost the only effort, but the diction was sharp and clean, and declarative sentences were adequate to the most highly stimulated sentiments. There were many passages reminiscent of Wilsonian rhetoric but without the apostolic tone characteristic of Wilson. The Scotch heritage of eloquence seems to have been better disciplined by Westminster than by Washington.

V. E. S.

IN THE PERIODICALS

PAGET, EDWIN H. *Will the Public Take the Medicine?* The Sewanee Review, July, 1929.

Under this rather colorful title, Professor Paget calls to the attention of political scientists the necessity of utilizing persuasive principles to secure changes in governmental forms and practices. "The important truth to realize," he says, "is that the problem (of governmental reform) is essentially one of *persuasion.*" Having established this fundamental thesis, Professor Paget goes on to suggest certain elements of persuasion which are particularly applicable to a campaign for the purpose of creating public sentiment for a governmental improvement. Among the elements mentioned are: objectivity, motivation, use of slogans, use of popular analogies, and arousal of the imagination. The purpose of the article is not to outline a complete plan of persuasive strategy, but "to indicate by illustration the attitudes which those who would effectively direct such a campaign should take toward the minds of the public, and to explain a few of the fundamental elements which this persuasive attack should possess."

JOHN A. MCGEE

WHYTE, A. G. *Our Three Political Leaders.* Fortnightly Review, Vol. 131, pp. 586 ff, May, 1929.

This article constitutes a chapter in some politico-sociological text-book on *Methods of Political Leadership.* The oratorical ability of the three men, Baldwin, MacDonald and Lloyd-George, is only one topic treated. Nothing very new or very acute is said. The analysis of ex-Premier Baldwin's puzzling position on rhetoric and oratory is typical:

> In his attitude towards the party and the public in general Mr. Baldwin follows the same principle of at once inviting and giving confidence. His often-expressed contempt for the art of rhetoric is an expression of his faith in the ultimate good sense of the British democracy. This is a faith which all politicians do

not share, but in Mr. Baldwin's case it is strong enough to survive the occasional waywardness of mass opinion. It leads him to make his appeal, on a moderate note, more to the men and women of no party, than to the adherents of any party. It leads him also to favor those policies which carry a broadly national character rather than those which are cleverly calculated to lead to an immediate party triumph. In short, the only party he has any desire to lead is one which is the consistent vehicle of national and Imperial statesmanship.

R. H. W.

POLEY, WALTER D. *Oratory in the Baldwin Parliament.* Contemporary Review, Vol. 135, No. 762, pp. 741-9, June, 1929.

The writer of this article begins by asking: "Is the art of Parliamentary oratory dying out?" and ends by lamenting that the government's large majority in the Baldwin parliament enabled the Whigs to force legislation through according to plan. He maintains that "the orators have been too economical with their purple patches, the light of perorations has too often been concealed." In the new parliament he looks for "more vigorous dialectical clashes, more unexpected interventions, more surprising denouements."

The article consists mainly of detailed criticisms of the leading parliamentary speakers of today, with many interesting comparisons of them with the speakers of the past. Poley comes nearer than other English critics to solving the great Enigma of British politics, Stanley Baldwin, who denounces oratory as the "harlot of the arts" but whose speeches "have all the effect upon his audience of great oratory." An excellent critique on Winston Churchill's methods and style is followed by a very inadequate and unintelligible one on Ramsay MacDonald, who is first said to resemble Gladstone closely, and is said later to be the victim of obscurity and bad style. Other speakers, as Lloyd-George, Philip Snowden, and Sir Joynson Hicks, whose speech on the Prayer-Book measure had great effect in 1927, are mentioned more briefly.

Uneven as the criticism is, it is interesting and thoughtful. One wonders why we do not have articles on "Oratory in the Coolidge Regime" in American periodicals.

R. H. W.

CLARK, JOHN HOLLEY JR., *Answer Yes or No,* North American Review, Vol. 228, No. 1, pp. 84-90, July, 1929.

"You may search the libraries in vain for any book telling of the art of being cross-examined." Lawyer Clark had had considerable practise in grilling witnesses on the stand. Then, one day, he was himself called up for cross-examination. The experience was an unpleasant one, and he began to investigate the subject. He found much to aid the questioner—Professor M. F. Quintilian, Dean of the Roman Law School and Francis Wellman among the most helpful; but he found none to aid the poor witness. This article, therefore, provides suggestions by Mr. Clark.

Don't answer yes or no if the question requires qualification or if the question is a complex one, like the classical "have you stopped beating your wife?"

Don't worry about appearing evasive. It is better than falling into a trap. Don't be afraid of being afraid of traps.

Don't be nervous.

Don't be foolish.

Don't be vain—susceptible to flattery.

Don't be prolix.

Don't forget that every dog has his day—including the ordinary lay witness. The discomfiting, table-turning repartee of of witnesses is recorded in all ages.

"Tell the truth and shame the devil—of a lawyer."

The article is not very original—after all, most of its precepts can be deduced from Wellman's books. But it might well be added to the bibliography of a debate course which includes dialectic or cross-examination.

R. H. W.

FOULKE, KATHERINE, AND STINCHFIELD, SARA M. *The Speech Development of Four Infants under Four Years of Age.* Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 140-171, March, 1929.

This, according to a resume conveniently printed as an addendum in French, German and Russian, is a study of the speech of four children and contains a complete analysis of their speech development from the eighth month to the twenty-second month.

Case I. In weight and height this infant is above the average,

but probably due to the delay of the speech impulse and to improper diet, the development of speech has been retarded somewhat.

Case II. Baby M's vocabulary was recorded during a 24-hour period at the age of twenty-one months. He used twenty-seven sentences during the day, talking to himself, in what Piaget calls the "collective monologue." Verbs were mostly in the present tense, and there was confusion in the use of the first personal pronoun. Phrases vary from one to five words each.

Case III. The third child studied was feeble at birth, showed evidence of having been rachitic and with latent tetany during infancy. He later became a stutterer. At twenty-one months his vocabulary consisted of about eighty-five words, and approximately twelve sentences. His speech was quite plain as compared with a number of children of his age. There were many sound substitutions. He used the inflectional forms, *good, best.*

Case IV. Baby R used his first word at eight months. By the age of nineteen months he was using phrases of three words, and had command of twenty consonants and eleven vowels. At twenty-two months the total number of words in his vocabulary is 403, the number having steadily increased from forty at the age of eighteen months.

G. W. G.

McKay, Frederick B. *Time Variability in Speaking.* Vox, Vol. VI, 50-60, July 1, 1929.

The subject of language has been approached in general from four different viewpoints: the grammatical, the metaphysical or philosophical, the psychological and the biological. Of these the most recent type of approach is the biological. It "seeks the basis for its conclusions upon the nature of the human organism and its method of functioning for communicative purposes within its environment."

In the study reported, the experimenter used the kymographic technique, taking simultaneous records of oral and of nasal phonation, and of oral and of nasal breath pressure. Time values were obtained in units of .01 sec. by means of an electric timer. Subjects were teachers or advanced students of speech. Words and

phrases were repeated into the mouthpiece, and recorded on smoked paper.

The results showed little uniformity in duration of the same sound when repeated by the same individual, and even less uniformity when spoken by different subjects. "Popular pronunciation (probably) represents a noticeably less degree of control than was found in these experiments."

Further experimentation is proposed, with the view of discovering the relation between the factor of time variability and anything resembling a standard of pronunciation.

G. W. G.

COLCORD, JOANNA C. *A Review of a Study of the Technique of Social Case Work Interview.* Social Forces, Vol. 7, pp. 519-27, June, 1929.

The sociologists are investigating the inter-relationship of speech and the social process. Miss Colcord's recent article is of interest to us not only because it aids the social worker, but because it offers the teacher of speech various hints of ways and means by which both conversation and conference-room speaking may be taught as speech subjects. Both of these phases of speech training have interested various members in our profession, and both are probably destined to play an increasingly important part in the speech curriculum of the future. Miss Colcord illustrates the meaning of such challenging terms as "lessening tension," the "hostess technique," "bring to the main issue" and "keeping to the main issue," "temporizing," "breaking defense," "forestalling objections," and numerous others. The article contains not a little of direct value to the teacher of speech, but it is even more significant in what it suggests for future research. Already writers in our field—such as Sandford and Yeager—have discussed the problem. The relation of speech to sociology and the study of group contacts may well prove as profitable a field of research and experimentation during the next decade as has the relation of speech to psychology during the past decade.

EDWIN H. PAGET,
North Carolina State College

ASSOCIATION NEWS

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION FOR 1929
HOTEL McALPIN—DECEMBER 30, 31, AND JANUARY 1

The Executive Council has selected as the days for our annual convention this year December 30th, 31st, and January 1st. The management of the McAlpin Hotel has offered us excellent accommodations for the housing of our members and for the various meetings. Arrangements are now in the process of completion. If there should be any change in the place of meeting, ample notice will be given to all members in the skeleton program which will be mailed during the first part of November.

Let me urge on all members the importance of sending to me at the earliest possible moment all suggestions that they wish to have considered for incorporation in the programs of the general sessions, group meetings, and round table discussions. So many members of the ASSOCIATION who have sent me invaluable suggestions have done so with an accompanying explanation of a modest desire not to dictate, that I am fearful lest other members of the ASSOCIATION, even more modest and retiring, are refraining from sending in equally pertinent and valuable suggestions. If you can think of any member of the ASSOCIATION whom you would like to hear, or if you know of any teacher anywhere who is doing work that you consider of distinctive merit in any field of speech, send me the information at once.

If, as it now seems probable, the arrangements with the McAlpin are satisfactorily completed, the hotel management will send you reservation cards showing the price range of their various rooms and giving you a convenient means of making your hotel reservations. Let me urge the importance of planning now to attend the convention, and of reserving your room at the headquarters hotel. The greater the proportion of our members actually present in the same building that houses the meetings of the convention, the more valuable will be the meetings of the convention, and the easier the renewal of old acquaintances, the forming of new acquaintances, and the informal exchange of ideas, which constitute one of the most, if not the most, delightful and profitable features of our annual meetings.

We are now assured of a reduced railway rate of one and one-half fares. Complete instructions as to how to secure your certificates when you purchase your ticket to New York will be printed in the outline of the program already mentioned.

F. M. RARIG, *President.*

NEWS AND NOTES

The first annual convention of the Western Teachers of Speech will be held the 29th and 30th of November, in San Francisco. The preliminary announcements make tentative plans for general and sectional meetings and discussion groups on all phases of Speech—Original Speaking, Interpretation, Dramatics, Speech Science, and the Teaching of Speech. The members of the committee in charge are: W. Arthur Cable, Chairman, University of Arizona; Earl W. Wells, Secretary, Oregon State College; Frederick W. Orr, Treasurer, University of Washington; Lee Emerson Bassett, Stanford University; and Charles A. Marsh, University of California at Los Angeles.

Another Western convention was held late in March, when the California State Board of Education called the Ninth Annual Conference of the Drama Teachers Association in Berkeley. All phases and problems of play production in the schools were discussed during the two-day period. Among the speakers were Miss Marion Brown, University High School, Oakland; William Pierce Hinsdale, College of the Pacific; Mrs. Evelyn Clement, of the State Department of Education; Glen Haydon, Department of Music, University of California; Willard E. Givens, Superintendent of Schools, Oakland; Miss Ruth Taft, Director of the Berkeley Children's Educational Theatre; Mrs. Mabel Gifford, of the Division of Speech Correction of the State Board of Education; K. L. Stockton, Principal of the Huntington Park High School; Samuel J. Hume, Director of the Summer School of Music, Drama, and Art at Mills College; Rudolph Schaeffer, School of Rhythmo-Chromatic Design, San Francisco; Miss Doris McIntyre, Director of Dramatic Art, Oakland. The Dramatic Workshops of the High Schools of Oakland presented Alfred Noyes' *Sherwood* the first evening, and the Berkeley Children's Educational Theatre gave a performance of Milne's *Make-Believe* the second evening.

The position of Depew Professor of Public Speaking, which was established this year by Mrs. Depew to honor the memory of her husband, will be filled by W. Hayes Yeager, who has resigned his position at the University of Illinois to accept the headship of the new department at George Washington University, Washington, D. C. Plans for the present year include courses in Principles of Effective Speaking, Business and Professional Speaking, Elementary Debate, Advanced Debate, Oral Interpretation of Literature, Persuasion and the Forms of Public Address, Masters of Public Address, Dramatization, Play Production, and the Teaching of Public Speaking.

Brigham Young University has changed the name of its Department

of Public Speaking and Dramatic Art to the Department of Speech. The chairman of the department, Alonzo Morley, spent the summer doing graduate work in the School of Speech of the University of Southern California.

Another State Association has been added to the growing list of state organizations in the Speech field. The Indiana Association of Teachers of Speech has not only been organized recently, but has already begun the publication of a journal, called the Indiana Journal of Speech, which will be published quarterly. The officers of the Association are L. R. Norvelle, Indiana University, President; J. A. McGee, Purdue University, Vice-President; and Mrs. Stith Thompson, Bloomington High School, Secretary-Treasurer. The committees of the new association are headed by the following teachers: A. H. Monroe, Purdue University, Aims and Methods of Teaching and Research; Claude Sifritt, Butler University, Debating; W. N. Otto, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Secondary School Problems; Robert E. Williams, De Pauw University, Dramatics; Pearle Le Compte, Evansville College, Oral Interpretation; and E. P. Trueblood, Earlham College, Oratory and Public Address. Mr. McGee is Editor of the Indiana Journal of Speech.

One of the most ambitious debate seasons to be reported in these pages is that of the past year of Baylor University, Texas. The teams from that institution conducted a tour which took them into ten states and two foreign countries, and brought them into competition with twenty institutions. These contests have been judged by radio audience, committees of judges, critic judges, and audience decisions.

Debating at Denison University will be handled as a curricular subject. Debates on subjects of current interest will be prepared and delivered before groups in the surrounding territory. Lionel Crocker is directing this activity.

The Forensic Union of Oberlin College, composed of those students actively interested in debating, has recently compiled an interesting report of its activities for the past year. During the year three questions were debated: Resolved, that Alfred E. Smith should be elected to the presidency of the United States; Resolved, that the principle of complete freedom of speech and press on political and economic subjects is sound; and Resolved, that the institution of trial by jury should be abolished. During the season twenty-five intercollegiate debates were conducted, and twenty-three extension debates. These last named debates were conducted between two Oberlin teams in near-by towns, under the auspices of such organizations as Rotary Clubs and lodges. Twenty-five students participated in these contests.

Denison University has recently built a platform for experimental work in dramatics, which is in charge of Richard Woellhof, who has gone to Denison from the North Shore Theatre Guild to develop dramatic activities at the Ohio institution. The Masquers, the organization which took third place last year at the Northwestern University tournament for

the Cumnock Cup, will continue to be the acting organization of the school.

Cleveland College is offering special courses for stutterers, given by Mr. Clarence A. Buchholz.

An interesting custom was inaugurated at the University of Wisconsin during this past year. Under the direction of Miss Gertrude Johnson of the Department of Speech, a Reading Hour was scheduled for each Tuesday from November through March. At this time, late in the afternoon, an hour was devoted to the reading of literature in a wide variety of material, including Browning, Tennyson, modern poetry, stories grave and gay, and plays. These hours have been informal, free of charge, and open to anyone in the University or in the town. Audiences have averaged from fifty to one hundred. For four of these hours—one each in November, December, January, February—outside readers were brought to Madison. On these occasions Ralph Dennis, Dean of the School of Speech of Northwestern University, read *If Winter Comes;* R. A. Tallcott, of the Ithaca Conservatory of Music, read *Hell Bent for Heaven;* Davis Edwards, of the University of Chicago, read *The King's Henchman;* and Lucine Finch, the well-known artist, read *Her Mammy's Stories.* These readings drew audiences numbering two hundred and over and afforded much pleasure to those who attended. The entire project served to add new interest to the field of oral interpretation and it is planned to continue to develop this work in the future.

The second annual Dramatic and Speech Institute, under the direction of the University Extension Division and the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin, was held at Madison during the first two weeks in July. At this time special courses in Pantomime, Play Production, Debating and Extemporary Speaking, Voice Training, Stage-Craft, Fundamentals of Speech, Stage Design, Character Study and Make-up, Costume Design, Religious Drama, Play Writing, Children's Dramatics, Psychology for Public Speakers, Personality and Social Adjustment, and a Study course in American One-Act Plays were offered. Faculty members included Miss Gladys Borchers, H. L. Ewbank, Lawrence Mendenhall, John Muyskens, Miss Ellen Hillstrom, Miss Ethel Rockwell, William C. Troutman, and William Varnum of the University of Wisconsin, and Harriet Dell Barr and Joy Woodford Crawford in addition.

Mount Holyoke College has recently opened a Laboratory Theater, created by English 26 Playshop, a group of students taking an experimental course in creative playwriting and in play production, under the direction of Miss Jeannette Marks. The new theatre has an auditorium finished in rough gray-white plaster, with woodwork of dark stain and hangings of old blue, and seats 135 spectators on dark-stained benches, arranged on an inclined floor. The first bill, presented late in May, consisted of three one-act plays written by members of the English Playshop group: *Soup*, by Constance Meadnis; *Die Keppel*, by Katherine Patrick; and *Black Wing*, by Bertha Gillespie.

Twelve public performances of one-act plays were given at the State

College of Washington by members of Maynard Lee Daggy's summer class in Dramatic Survey. Major productions planned for the current year include *The Enemy*, by Channing Pollock; *Beyond the Horizon*, by Eugene O'Neill; *Loose Ankles*, by Sam Janney; *The Swan*, by Molnar; and *The Mollusc*, by H. H. Davis.

The program of plays at Nebraska Wesleyan University last year included *The Fortune Hunter*, by Winchell Smith; *He and She*, by Rachel Crothers; *R. U. R.*, by Capek; *The Big Idea*, by A. E. Thomas and Clayton Hamilton; and *The Romantic Age*, by Milne. The performances were directed by Miss Frances Goodhue.

The East Tech Players, of East Technical High School of Cleveland, have presented recently *To the Ladies*, by Kaufman and Connelly; *Two Dollars, Please*, by Margaretta Stevenson; *Lightnin'*, by Winchell Smith and Frank Bacon; *What Every Woman Knows*, by Barrie; *Captain Applejack*, by Walter Hackett; and Shakespeare's *As You Like It* and *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

Last season was an active one for the Greensboro College Players, of North Carolina. Scenes from *The Merchant of Venice*, Barrie's *Quality Street*, and *As You Like It*, in addition to several groups of one-act plays, comprised the work of the season. The shorter plays included *Followers*, by Brighouse; *The Turtle Dove*, by Margaret Oliver; *Mansions*, by Hildegarde Flanner; *The Nativity*, a Christmas pageant; *Cinderella Married*, by Rachel Luman Field; and *The Blue and Green Mat of Abdul Hassan*, by Constance Wilcox.

The production program for the current year at Brigham Young University includes the Alumni Play, *Tommy;* Shaw's *Pygmalion and Galatea;* the Theta Alpha Phi Play, *The Outsider—Enchanted Cottage*, by Brandon; Barrie's *Dear Brutus*, and the High School Play, *Two Girls Wanted*, by Unger. The University will again sponsor the State One-Act Play Contest in April.

PERSONALS

Elizabeth Avery died August 12. An appreciation of her life and work will appear in the next number of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL.

Charles Henry Woolbert died June 9. An article upon his work as teacher and writer will appear in February.

Dr. and Mrs. Smiley Blanton sailed in August for a year abroad, during which time Dr. Blanton will have an opportunity to study with Sigmund Freud in Vienna. Dr. Blanton is a member of the staff of the Child Study Foundation at Vassar College.

B. C. Van Wye, of the University of Cincinnati, is taking a leave of absence this year and will spend the time abroad. In company with Mrs. Van Wye, he plans to visit Cuba, Honolulu, Japan, China, India, and Egypt before going to London, where he will spend some time in study. Arthur S. Postle, of Ohio Wesleyan University, will take charge of his classes during his absence.

Miss Juliet Barker, of the Kansas State Teachers College, was the visiting instructor in Speech at the Denison University summer session. At present she is a member of the staff of the Goodman Theatre in Chicago.

William H. Veateh, of the State College of Washington, spent a part of the summer in graduate study in the School of Speech of the University of Southern California.

Mrs. Grace Douglas Leonard, formerly of the State College of Washington, is now doing graduate work in the School of Speech at Northwestern University. During the past Summer Session she directed the performance of *The Patsy* at Pullman.

W. P. Sandford has returned to the University of Illinois after a year's leave of absence, during which he secured his Ph. D. degree in English and Rhetoric from the Ohio State University. He has resumed the direction of the courses in Public Speaking. Other changes on the Illinois staff include the addition of Leon C. McCarty, formerly of the University of Cincinnati, who will handle the debate work in place of Hayes Yeager, who goes to George Washington University as Depew Professor of Public Speaking. Virgil L. Baker, formerly of the Illinois staff, has resigned to accept the position of chairman of the Division of Public Speaking in the University of Arkansas. His position at Illinois wll be taken by C. M. Trunick, of Ohio State University.

Louis A. Mallory, formerly head of the Speech Department at the Northern State Teachers College, Marquette, Michigan, has accepted the position of head of that department at the University of Wyoming. Mr. Mallory studied at the University of Wisconsin during the past year.

Oscar Ingram, who received his Master's Degree in Speech at the University of Wisconsin last June, will head the Department of Speech at Kansas Wesleyan University this year.

Charles H. Walters, a graduate of Detroit City College, has accepted the position of assistant in Speech at Butler University.

Lyman S. Judson, who recently received his Master's Degree from the University of Michigan, is now research assistant at the University of Iowa.

Claude Kantner has resigned his position at Kalamazoo High School, Michigan, to do graduate work this year at the University of Wisconsin.

Richard Woellhof, of the North Shore Theatre Guild, and formerly of the University of Michigan, has joined the staff of the Speech Department at Denison University, where he will have charge of dramatics.

Miss Severina Nelson, of the University of Illinois, spent the summer studying speech correction and dramatics at the University of Michigan.

Miss Clelah Cooper, formerly instructor in Speech at the State College of Washington, is now a member of the Winniger Dramatic Company, one of the best known repertoire companies of the Middle West. During the past year Miss Cooper played an engagement of forty weeks with the Maylon Players.

Richard Dunham, who was instructor at Cornell University during the past summer, has accepted the position of instructor in Public Speaking and director of Dramatics in the College of the City of Detroit.

Miss Elizabeth Goepp has been added to the staff in English and Public Speaking at the New Jersey College for Women. She spent the past year doing graduate work in dramatics at Cornell University.

Miss Augusta Sample has resigned her position at Davenport College to accept that of assistant in Spoken English and Dramatic Art at Greensboro College, North Carolina.

Miss Dorothy De Witt, who received her Master's Degree in Speech from the University of Michigan in the spring, is now a member of the staff at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater. Her courses there in Phonetics and Speech Correction are the first of the kind in the state of Oklahoma.

H. C. Harshbarger has resigned his position at Cornell University to accept an assistant professorship in Speech at the University of Iowa.

Ulric Moore has been added to the staff in English and Public Speaking at the University of Washington, where he will be in charge of the classes in oral interpretation and dramatics. Mr. Moore spent the past year doing graduate work at Cornell University.

Miss Florence Felten has joined the faculty of the Kansas State Teachers College at Pittsburgh, where she will have charge of the classes in oral interpretation and dramatics. Miss Felten was recently granted her Master's degree at the University of Wisconsin.

Miss Mildred Throne, of Western Reserve University, spent part of last year completing her M. A. work at the University of Wisconsin. During her absence from Cleveland Miss Alpha Roth, who was formerly of the State Teachers of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, was in charge of her classes.

J. Wesley Swanson, director of dramatics at the University of Illinois, spent the summer travelling and studying abroad.

Harry B. Gough, who spent the summer teaching at West Virginia University, has resumed his position as chairman of the department at De Pauw University, Indiana.

Harry Caplan, of Cornell University, has returned to his work after a year in Europe and Northern Africa as Guggenheim Fellow. Professor Caplan was continuing his research in medieval rhetoric.

Miss Dorothy Kaucher has resigned her position at the University of Missouri to take charge of the work in speaking and reading at Wells College.

Professor Russell Niles, of the University of Colorado, has resigned to teach law in New York University. He is succeeded by Mack Easton, of Cornell. Mr. Dayton McKean, instructor in public speaking at the University of Colorado, has resigned to accept an instructorship at Princeton. He is succeeded by Milton Badger of the University of Utah.

Professor James Watt Raine, of Berea College, is spending a leave of absence in study in Edinburgh.

Professor Howard Woodward returned in September to Western Re-

serve University from a year's leave of absence spent abroad. After enjoying Vienna most of the winter, he and Mrs. Woodward left there in February to visit Egypt, Palestine, Greece, and Turkey. Among the interesting experiences of the summer was attendance in München on invitation of Max Reinhardt of rehearsals of *Danton's Tod*.

Assistant Professor Barclay S. Leathem of Western Reserve University and Mrs. Leathem are studying in the University of Vienna and in the Reinhardt School of Acting and Directing. During Mr. Leathem's leave of absence Mr. Charles P. Green will be in charge of dramatic work in Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.

Direction of the extensive debating activities of Western Reserve University this year will be in the hands of Mr. Wm. A. D. Millson, Instructor in Speech. Mr. Millson received the LL. B. degree last June from the Western Reserve Law School.

John B. Emperor, formerly of Cornell, and for the past two years instructor in English and Public Speaking at the University of Missouri, has accepted an assistant professorship in the English department of the University of Tennessee; there he will have charge of the work in Public Speaking and Debating. Argus J. Tresidder, also of Cornell, and last year instructor in English at the University of Kansas, will also instruct in Public Speaking at the University of Tennessee this year.

Miss Sina Fladeland, who received the Master's degree from Pennsylvania State College, has charge of the work in speech correction at Perkins Institute for the Blind. Blind herself, she has been remarkably successful in improving the speech of her blind pupils. Her work is supervised by Dr. Sara Stinchfield of Mt. Holyoke College.

Miss Vera Sickels of Smith College offered a course in the teaching of oral reading and one in the teaching in speech in secondary schools at Teachers College, Columbia University, this summer.

Miss Ruth Cooper, of Smith College, studied phonetics in Germany the second semester of last year. She will work in France and England this year, and return to Smith College in September, 1930.

Miss Lizbeth Laughton was chairman of the Department at Smith College last year while Miss Elizabeth Avery was on leave.

C. L. Menser, of Knox College has been studying the European Theatre for the past six months, visiting France, Italy, Sicily, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Holland, Belgium, and England. He saw many performances and was particularly interested in *King Lear* in Czechish, Reinhardt performances in Vienna, and the Shaw festival in Malvern, England.